The Catholic Faith
and
The Religious Situation

✠

The Transfiguration Lectures for 1921

BY

THE BISHOP OF LONG ISLAND

AND

REVEREND DOCTORS

JENKS,

BLUNT,

WATERMAN,

STEWART,

PENFOLD

MGE3
C3633

PUBLISHED BY
THE CHURCHMEN'S ALLIANCE
126 CLAREMONT AVENUE
NEW YORK CITY

Library of the
Church Divinity School
of the Pacific

No. _____ Class _____
Ex Dono Silva Lake
Date 1960

MGE3
C3633
2170

AUTHOR

TITLE
The Catholic faith and the religiou
ituation

ATE DUE | BORROWER'S NAME

68 | J Barry Williams
S WADN CDSP
CBGTU

NO. 45 | GA

MGE3
C3633
2170

Library of the
Church Divinity School
of the Pacific

[illegible]

The Catholic Faith and the Religious Education

A SERIES OF ADDRESSES

Given under the auspices of

THE TRANSFIGURATION BRANCH

of the

CHURCHMEN'S ALLIANCE

June, 1911

GIFT OF
Bishop Parker
of the
PACIFIC
LIBRARY

Price 35 cents, postage paid

Address THE CHURCHMEN'S ALLIANCE
120 CLAREMONT AVENUE
NEW YORK CITY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/catholicfaithrel0000vari

The Catholic Faith and the Religious Situation

A SERIES OF ADDRESSES

Given under the auspices of

THE TRANSFIGURATION BRANCH

of the

CHURCHMEN'S ALLIANCE

Lent, 1921

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL
of the
PACIFIC
LIBRARY

Price 35 cents; three copies for $1

Address: THE CHURCHMEN'S ALLIANCE
126 CLAREMONT AVENUE
NEW YORK CITY

MGF3
C3633

Contents

1. **The Lambeth Appeal.**

Rt. Rev. Frederick Burgess, D.D., Bishop of Long Island

Note: Are Bishops Essential to Valid Ordinations?

(From the American Church Monthly, March, 1921).

2. **The Theological Position of the Anglo-Catholic Congress**

Arthur Whipple Jenks, D.D., General Theological Seminary.

3. **Anglo-Catholicism To-day.**

Simon Blinn Blunt, D.D., All Saints Church, Boston, Mass.

4. **Characteristic Positions of Modern Protestantism.**

Lucius Waterman, D.D., Tilton, N. H.

5. **The Full Catholic Faith the Need in the Present Unrest.**

George Craig Stewart, D.D., L.H.D., St. Luke's Church, Evanston, Ill.

6. **The Duty of Catholics To-day.**

Frederick Spies Penfold, D.D., St. Stephen's Church, Providence, R. I.

Preface

The addresses herein contained constitute a series given on Monday evenings in the Lenten season of 1921 at the Church of the Transfiguration, New York City. The subjects of the addresses were suggested by the two important events in the religious world during the summer of 1920—The Anglo-Catholic Congress and the Lambeth Conference. Anglo-catholicism and Protestantism are the definite and, practically, mutually exclusive, terms of modern English-speaking Christian groups. The Anglo-Catholic Congress spoke out clearly and without apology on the Church's position as related to all other groups. The Lambeth Conference, differently constituted, but with no legislative powers, meeting unofficially with the Archbishop of Canterbury, as his personal guests, and having by no means a monopoly of theological learning, attempted to mediate between the Church and Protestantism on certain points of difference. The latter listened courteously and has since uttered comments which indicate failure very largely to sympathize with or even to understand the language of Church theologians. The Lambeth Conference already presents the appearance of a waning influence on the positive side. On matters of secondary importance, e. g. the ministry of women, the Lambeth Resolutions have succeeded mainly in sowing seeds of new controversies and unpleasantness. Anglo-Catholicism, be it said in all humility, is the only positive Christian system untrammelled by obligations to the State, uncompromised by the formal errors of personal leaders, and unfettered by unhistorical claims, e. g. the papacy, and by uncatholic terms of communion.

The papers contained in this volume are intended to expand and develop these considerations and to stimulate those who read them to widespread and energetic propagation of the Catholic Faith, full and unadulterated, as no partisan pronouncement, but the need of the world in the unrest, religious, moral, intellectual, and social, of the present day.

The conjunction of S. Mark's Day with the fourth week of Eastertide suggests that the combination of the characteristic petitions of the proper collects expresses the need of the Christian world today.

"Give us grace that, being not like children carried away with every blast of vain doctrine, we may be established in the truth of Thy holy Gospel"; "that so, among the sundry and manifold changes of the world, our hearts may surely there be fixed where true joys are to be found."

St. Mark's Day, 1921.

1.

The Lambeth Appeal

THE Lambeth Appeal to all Christian People, which is our subject tonight, was adopted after full and free debate by the Conference with an overwhelming vote, only four voices being heard in the negative. By the action of the House it was not subjected to verbal amendment, but was passed in the form in which it came from the Committee. After the vote had been taken the assembled Bishops rose and sang the Doxology, because they felt that the action marked a new and important step in the direction of the visible unity of Christ's Church.

The few who spoke and voted for the negative must necessarily have searched their hearts and minds, as they asked themselves if they were justified in opposing a measure which had the strong approval of the vast majority of their brethren.

If, therefore, to-night we venture to subject the Appeal to criticism, let it not for one moment be thought that we do not heartily endorse and echo the noble spirit of charity which the Appeal breathes in every line and word. Never before has such a stirring call been made for unity, never before has any Christian Assembly sent out to those from whom it was separated by centuries of dissent so tender and yearning a plea to join together, with all differences hushed, in the united service of Him Who is our common Lord.

But the Lambeth Conference does not legislate, and it is only right that every effort should be made by Churchmen to have clear thinking upon this great question of unity. The Appeal must, therefore, be subjected to study and perhaps to stern criticism by those who will influence legislation in the Councils and Conventions of our great Communion.

But we can never fully appreciate or do justice to the Appeal unless we can enter into the intellectual and moral atmosphere which pervaded Lambeth Palace on July 5th, 1920, as the 253 Bishops assembled from all parts of the world in answer to the summons of the Primate of all England to re-

ceive encouragement from one another and to consider questions involving the religious hope and the moral welfare of mankind.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in the short but impressive speech with which as Presiding Officer he opened the sittings of the Conference, struck the note which was to sound in every important motion, speech, or paper to which the members were to listen. So far as your lecturer knows, there is no copy or even resumè of this address, and all he can do is to give in his own language the general import of the speech as he remembers it. The Archbishop, after stating that it had been his great privilege to preside at the Conference of 1908, said that if any one of the Bishops present at that time had risen in that room and had ventured to prophesy that, before another Conference should be held, the greatest Christian nations of the world would have been involved in a cruel and devastating war, where each would seek to outdo the others in inventing instruments of destruction, that seven millions of men, mostly young, would be slaughtered, that hostile ships would attack the English shores, that airships would bomb the inland cities and that, within the radius of a mile of that very palace where they were sitting, shells would be falling and pitilessly wrecking the lives and property of the innocent and defenceless, such a prophet would have been regarded as a madman, and bankers and statesmen alike would have answered his words with reproof or with ridicule. And yet every word would have been true, every line of the prophesy would have been fulfilled, and now in the midst of a civilized world, where many hearts are breaking with sorrow, where nations are almost on the verge of bankruptcy, where men and women are making shipwreck of their faith, the Church needs to speak with one voice the message of its Lord. In the face of all these sad facts, and in stern consciousness of the failure of the Christian Church to make its voice heard above the booming of the cannon and the bursting of the shells and the explosion of the mines during the war, we should, now that peace has come, to use the language which the Encyclical later adopted, think of the reunion of Christendom "not as a laudable ambition or as a beautiful dream, but as an imperative necessity." If the Church is united, its sound will go out into all lands and its words unto the ends of the world.

If this then was the moral feeling inspiring the Appeal, the intellectual atmosphere is represented best perhaps by Dr. Headlam's Bampton Lectures on Reunion, preached during the winter of 1920 at Oxford and published just before the Lambeth Conference assembled.

Dr. Headlam opens his lectures with this statement, "It is reported that when the British Army entered France, the village priests, influenced by the instinct of religious and national sympathy, offered the use of their Churches for the service of the troops. The authorities of the Roman Church in England intervened. They complained to Rome and the offer was disallowed. It is reported again that on more than one occasion when, on the eve of a great offensive, with the prospect of immediate death before them, pious members of the Presbyterian or Nonconformist Churches desired to receive the Communion at the hands of a Church of England Chaplain, their request was refused." This paragraph shows the object of these lectures, which is to do away with such differences by producing an organic unity of the Church. It is hard to sum up a great and learned book in a few words, but Dr. Headlam's scheme, if carried out, would imply the two following principles:

First, he would acknowledge and recognize the validity of the orders of the ministries of all religious bodies. If great irregularity, carelessness, or indifference were proved, as for instance in the case of a Nonconformist divine at whose ordination the chief part of the ceremony consisted in the shaking of hands, he would draw the line. "We cannot," he says, "recognize slovenliness and indifference." But all other ordinations he would welcome as valid, and while, if unity could be brought about with any of these Communions, he would give their ministers a commission and solicit for our own Clergy similar powers, yet on no account should there be anything like ordination. "The laying on of hands," he says, "has been done already. The sacramental part of the rite has been performed, but the ecclesiastical rules have not been fulfilled. The essential part of them is the ordination by a Bishop. That being a rule of the Church, the Church can dispense with it and, without it, can confer authority on those already ordained."

But secondly, all future ordinations must be Episcopal. This follows as a necessity on his theory that the Episcopacy is necessary for a united Church. He calls it the "Catholic Rule." "When the Church departed from the Catholic rule, the result was a loss of freedom and unity. The Papacy destroyed freedom, Protestantism destroyed unity and order. It is, then, not because I believe that the historical Episcopacy is necessary for valid orders, but because I believe that it is necessary to secure Christian unity that I hold it must be the rule of a re-united Church." In another place Dr. Headlam says with equal clearness, "The meaning of the Apostolic Succession in the Church is not that it is necessary for the validity of Orders, but that it is an external mark of the unity and continuity of the Church. This mutual participation, therefore, in the Consecration of Bishops will be the sign that we are one body and not many separated ones."

This book, which was widely read among the Bishops and found many sympathizers, is an indication of the attitude which was at that time prevalent. Too long have we had dissension and strife. Let us see what we can give up, so that we can unite with others. And the first thing they laid their hands on as convenient to throw overboard was the Apostolic Succession. It is by comparing the Appeal with Dr. Headlam's book that we can see and understand the principles which it maintains.

First, then, the Appeal does not accept the validity of non-Episcopal Orders. This is very important to observe, because the opposite has been asserted. It uses language which to an uncritical reader would imply validity. For instance it says, "It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of these Communions which do not possess the Episcopate. On the contrary, we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace." The ordinary layman would say that such language can mean only the cordial, hearty endorsement of the orders of all Christian bodies, and also the acknowledgment of their validity. But not at all, because later the Appeal demands Episcopal Ordination as the only way of obtaining a Catholic Ministry or, as it expresses it, "a ministry throughout the whole fellowship." Dr. Carnegie Simpson saw this inconsist-

ency. "Let us look," he said, "at this insistence upon Episcopal ordination which, though it is quietly introduced in but three words at the end of a sentence, is the crux of the whole business, and should have been printed in capitals." "Without this ordination," he adds, "Anglicanism can not accept us as being a true branch of the Church or as possessing a true ministry of Word and Sacrament. If this is so, the generous things said in other parts of the Lambeth pronouncement really mean very little." Dr. Simpson has, by his words, helped us to realize that the Bishops assembled at Lambeth never intended to recognize the orders of Nonconformists, however truly might be impressed upon their minds and hearts the great truth illustrated all through the ages and in every part of the world that God is not bound by Sacraments, but, as Bishop Gore expresses it, "can be freely believed to have given His gifts of grace as and when He pleased." Or we can legitimately paraphrase St. Peter's words, "God is no respecter of persons but in every Church he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is acceptable with Him."

But, while rejecting any recognition of the validity of non-Episcopal ordination, the Appeal does on the other hand accept and apparently heartily endorse Dr. Headlam's utilitarian idea of the Episcopate. He urges the necessity of future Episcopal Ordination as any statesman might, because, counting the Greek, Russian, and Roman Churches, there is a preponderating reason in the argument from numbers in favor of Episcopacy. "Considerations alike of history and of present experience," the Appeal says, "justify the claim we make in behalf of the Episcopate, that it can be the ministry of the whole body." The Appeal nowhere comes out with any statement of Apostolic Succession or of Grace of Orders or any real indication of why the Anglican Communion clings to the Episcopate, save this, that by accepting a commission through a Bishop's ordination the man will obtain "a ministry throughout the whole fellowship." Of course everyone knew that the Conference, as a Conference, believed in Ordination as conferring grace, but it is plain that it was not thought to be diplomatic or statesmanlike to incorporate into the Appeal any such reference. I wonder if it was the Appeal which caused the Jesuit writer, Chaplain Walker, in his book on "The Problem of Reunion," to make this astounding state-

ment, that the Anglican Church has never committed herself to the position that the Episcopacy originated with the Apostles or that by it sacramental power is handed down. This looseness of thought will make the Anglican proposals welcome to Free Churchmen. "Today," he says, "The Anglican Episcopate, in the event of reunion, is not only to become democratic, but it is to be accepted apart from any theory as to its character. That is even more than the Puritans dared to ask for. In submitting to Episcopacy thus offered and reformed, Free Churchmen will not in reality be making concessions, they will be celebrating a victory." One wonders if the language of our pronouncement justifies this gently veiled sarcasm.

With these two features of the Appeal clearly in our minds, the insistence on reordination of non-Episcopal ministers and the purely mechanical or constitutional reason for accepting a commission "throughout the whole fellowship," I am ready to state my own reason for voting to reject the Appeal. To be allowed to do this before this audience of thoughtful and educated Churchmen I recognize to be an almost priceless privilege.

I would say that, while I appreciate the strong argument put forth by the Bishop of Vermont, yet my own line of thought was ethical. My objection to the Appeal was on moral grounds. If the Church should seek to gain outward unity by lowering the standard of ordination and by asking men to do anything which should be against the conscience, the movement is not only doomed to failure, it is bound to do harm which may be irreparable. The Appeal itself says, "We believe that, for all, the truly equitable approach to unity is by the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences." That this principle has not been held to and that what is asked from non-Episcopal ministers in the way of sacrifice can not be justified by the moral reason, and that, therefore, this Church of ours would depart from the highest precepts of the Gospels if it carried out the proposals of the Appeal, is the burden of this lecture. I realize that it might be regarded as an act of audacity thus to arraign the action of the Conference, but the issue is too serious for personal consideration, and those who see rocks ahead, as the ship forges its track through the waves, have a right to cry out their warn-

ing, even if every officer on board maintains that the rocks and the booming surf are only an hallucination.

Before explaining this position it must be pointed out that the Lambeth Appeal is one-sided. While it is headed "An Appeal to All Christian People," and while it has an allusion to the other ancient Episcopal Communions in East and West, yet it is plainly addressed to the non-Episcopal Communions in England and Scotland, and does not try to meet conditions outside the British Isles. Again and again in debates the Conference had to be reminded that it was not national, but world-wide, that its suggestions and resolutions must be applicable to every branch of the Anglican Communion throughout the world. Here in America, where millions are coming to our cities from Southern and Eastern Europe, the problem of unity is essentially different from what it is in England and Scotland. One cannot help feeling that the Appeal for unity would have been helped if the Bishops had stretched out cordial hands toward the Greek and Russian and also the Roman Churches. The inclusion of the great Episcopal Churches, now unhappily divided from us, would have made the Appeal more truly Catholic and might have eliminated several ambiguous or difficult passages. But it is plainly an appeal to the non-Episcopal Churches or Communions of England to accept from the hands of the Church of England Bishops Episcopal Ordination, so that the vision of a visibly united Church may be realized.

This, then, being the scope of the Appeal, demanding in unequivocal terms Episcopal Ordination for all non-Episcopally appointed ministers, it is not difficult to see the ethical objections which were urged to its adoption by one at least of those assembled.

It does not need a Pope, it does not need a canon, to tell us that it is a sacrilege to repeat the Sacrament of Ordination. That law is written in the human heart and is upheld by the human conscience. If a man consents to be re-ordained it must be because he believes his own ordination to have been invalid. For were he to consent to go through the ceremony again, while believing that the first had been all sufficient in the eyes of God, he would stultify the noblest instincts of his heart. Dr. Headlam has understood this and, having granted that the non-Episcopal Ordinations are valid, he does not in

his scheme seek to outrage men's consciences and propose a new Ordination, but only the acceptance of a commission, and, by insisting on future ordinations by Bishops, he hopes in this way to render the unity of the Church secure for all time.

But what does the Lambeth Appeal do? It asks men, the spiritual reality of whose ministry it recognizes, to submit to re-ordination at a Bishop's hands; and for what? Because by this act they will receive a new power and grace? because by it they will fulfill the law of Christ and receive from His hands the gift of His Holy Spirit? No, not at all; but in order that they may receive a ministry acknowledged throughout the whole Church. But it really presents us with no reason why the Church should not have a Presbyterian ministry rather than an Episcopal, save the argument from numbers. It is a cold mechanical view of Ordination, and it is therefore no wonder that from one after the other of devout and learned divines there should have come a strong protest. Dr. Carnegie Simpson I have already quoted. Dr. W. B. Selbie, Principal of Mansfield College, says, perhaps satirically, "It will make all the difference if the Episcopal Ordination suggested for non-Anglican ministers is only an extension of commission comparable to that which Anglicans themselves state they are willing to receive from the Free Churches. This is a very different thing from re-ordination, but the report itself does not make it clear which of the two interpretations is meant." Dr. Alfred E. Garvie, Principal of New College, says, "For so blessed a consummation as the reunion of the divided Church of Christ I personally should be prepared to go further than many Congregationalists in abandoning tradition and convention, theories and practice, which might stand in the way; but what would be involved for me in the acceptance of the Bishops' proposal would be the abandonment of a principle for which, if need be, I should be ready to die." And Dr. Orchard, in an address before the Society of Free Catholics, says that there is need of better understanding between Catholics and Protestants before unity can be reached. "What has kept the Episcopate alive is a theory, the theory that it is through the Episcopate alone that valid orders are conveyed; and until that is either given up by the one side or accepted by the other, the difficulties

will be concealed but will only break out worse again after attempts at compromise."

These quotations are all from men who have been sincerely working and studying in the cause of unity. What then, can we think, would be the answer of the rank and file of Protestant ministers to any such proposal?

It has been a surprise to me to hear men talk glibly about re-ordination. It startled me to listen to Bishops declaring on the floor at Lambeth that they would, for the sake of unity, submit to re-consecration. It would seem to need little imagination to picture the barrenness and horror of such a mockery of service. A minister of Christ looks back on the ordination hour as the most solemn event of his life, when he received his commission from the Lord, and so long as he believes that service to be valid he cannot consent to repeat it. The Rev. G. H. Clayton, in a paper read before the Anglo-Catholic Congress, declares, "I would most willingly submit to conditional re-ordination, if by that means I thought I could do anything towards healing the wounds of Christendom." Such a statement as that seems incomprehensible. I do not know what conditional re-ordination can mean. So far as I know, no such service has ever been held in all Christian history. Conditional Baptism is something recognized by the Church when there is doubt as to the fact or the form of any previous Baptism, but Ordination is something which is conferred only on men of ripe years, and the man who cannot recall his Ordination would be unfit for ministry in any Church.

No, we are forced back to the true principle of the threefold Ministry as the Episcopal Church has always held it through all its troubled history. It is the Catholic truth that only a Bishop can ordain, and that the Apostolic Ministry ranks with the Apostolic Scriptures and the Apostolic Creed. Never was the tyranny of Parliament more cruelly shown than when the English Government refused to permit Bishops to be consecrated for the thirteen Colonies of America. There exists a pathetic letter, written in the 18th century, when the Connecticut Clergy pleaded with the Archbishop of Canterbury to give them the Episcopate. "Two young men", it says, "recently ordained by your grace were lost at sea. Of the fifty young men who have been sent to England for ordina-

tion during the previous 40 years, ten have perished from sickness or shipwreck." I think that is a larger proportion than that of the killed in our late war.

Now had the English Church held any but the highest doctrine of Orders, what would have saved us from doing what the Church of Sweden does today in the missionary field, authorizing ordination by Presbyters? As it was, the Church in the American Colonies went on for generations without Bishops, without confirmations or Ordinations, and stunted in size and spirit by lack of the Episcopate, and testified to the truth which no usurpation of spiritual power by Parliament or Crown could destroy, that the Episcopate is not, as has been claimed, a "mere matter of administrative convenience," but essential to the handing down of the Ministry commissioned by our Lord, when He said to His Apostles, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Bishop Lightfoot sums up his great essay on the Christian Ministry in these words, "If the preceding investigation be substantially correct, the three-fold Ministry can be traced to Apostolic direction; and short of an express statement we can possess no better assurance of a divine appointment or at least a divine sanction. If the facts do not allow us to unchurch other Christian communities differently organized, they may at least justify our jealous adhesion to a policy derived from this source." In these words does the Church's great scholar vindicate the Ordination principles of the Prayer Book, and present the minimum of conviction on which the minister of another Communion can seek the laying on of a Bishop's hand in ordination. The young man who in the 18th century left his home, his father and mother, his friends, and all that made life lovely and beautiful in the New England or Virginia of those days and embarked in the flimsy little sailing vessel to face the dangers of the Atlantic, made no such sacrifice as does the minister, who in these days will give up the traditions of his life, the association with men whom he respects, renounce, for so in a sense he must do, all his former ministerial life and brave the sea of obloquy and misunderstanding, neglect and slander and contempt and, perhaps, poverty, in order that he may find a Lambeth Palace where, in the Chapel with its crowded memories, he may kneel before a Bishop and answer the question, "Do you think in your heart that you are truly called, accord-

ing to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and according to the Canons of this Church, to the order and Ministry of the Priesthood?"

It was because the Lambeth Appeal presented to my mind no sufficient reason for a sacrifice so complete and a renunciation so heart-stirring, and because it laid no stress on, but rather seemed to ignore any sacramental grace in Ordination, that I for one could not vote for it. It was in such a spirit that a minority could join in singing a doxology, praising God for the blessing of charity towards all, and praying Him that what seemed in the Appeal an error in judgment might be overruled for good.

We have finished our perhaps unwelcome criticism of the latest attempt to solve the problem of Christian unity. Whether our argument has been convincing or not, more and more it has been borne in on our mind that, by emphasizing the necessity of Orders, we have been taking the wrong path through the forest. It is the Apostolic Faith in Jesus Christ, as perfect man and Perfect God, which alone will lead us on to the City of God.

The world is sick today for lack of faith. No one can look at all deeply at the underlying facts of our so-called Christian civilization and not see that the foundation is weak indeed. Paganism is all about us. Our boys, yes and perhaps even more our girls also, in their schools and colleges, look at supernatural theology as a thing of the past, and echo the rationalism they have heard in their lecture rooms. Our modern cities are dotted with ecclesiastical buildings, most of them conveying little symbolic meaning and possessing slight beauty. From their pulpits, if you can believe the papers, there is little preaching of Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour of the soul. "Let it always be remembered," says a bright writer of our day, "that no one can invent a theory so absurd but that someone can be found who will believe it." And these theories are all about us. When they have to do with politics or economics or governments, they are sad enough, but when they invade the Church, they produce a befogging of the mind and a subsequent shipwreck of faith. Naturalism in all its phases has been tried and found wanting. The Christ who is a myth, no matter how beautiful may be the rhetoric with which He is described, gives no help to save

a man from sin when he meets temptation, or to give him grace when he faces bankruptcy or sickness or death. Modernism, which seemed to promise so much and to be preserving all the poetry of Christianity without the burden of its miracles, was discovered at last to be only like some exquisitely painted picture of a stream of water shown to a traveller perishing from thirst in a desert. It has only emphasized despair. Young people are brought up to think that faith is only an individual thing, and the Church does not hold it out to them with authority and affection. And yet more and more we are finding out that the Christ can only be believed in as the Church has revealed Him in its Scriptures and Creed, truly the man, yet with meat to eat which the world does not know, the Saviour because He is the Son of God.

Liddon, at the end of that great book of his, The Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of our Lord, the greatest book the English Church produced during the 19th century, a book which every Clergyman should read every two years in his ministerial life, has a noble passage, where he claims that "a heartier, more meditative, more practical grasp of the Divinity of Jesus will one day again unite His children in the bonds of a restored unity." "Is it altogether chimerical," he asks, "to expect that Christians who believe Christ to be truly God, will see more clearly what is involved in that faith and what is inconsistent with it; that they will supply what is wanting or will abandon what is untenable in their creed and practice, so that before men and angels they may openly unite in the adoring confession of their Divine Head?"

In view of such a statement as this, we cannot but look with deep regret at the only practical result of the Geneva World Conference which has as yet come to our ears. I refer to the proposal by the Executive Committee of our Commission that the Bishops should open local conferences to discuss whether a creed is necessary or desirable, and, if found to be so, what creed is desirable. Sadly and yet boldly we submit that such an attitude does not represent the Church which through all the centuries has been true to the Faith. In old days Christians were ready to be thrown into the arena to be torn to pieces by the lions. Surely they are not now ready to fling the ancient symbols of their Faith on the platform to be torn and discussed by unbelieving critics while a Bishop

presides at the ceremony. The watch-word of progress and even democracy, however stirring the slogan may be, cannot be used in this way. The Church of Jesus Christ will progress and does progress, but not by denying the Faith about the nature and person of Jesus Christ which was declared by the councils of Nicea and Chalcedon. Rather it is to progress by building on that foundation its spires and arches to point the road to Heaven. The modern age often thinks it is progressing when it is only destroying.

The preservation of the Catholic Faith is closely connected with our theme, for it will not escape the careful student of Church history that this faith in the supernatural Christ has had its firmest hold in connection with the Apostolic Ministry. Can we not see, therefore, that this Church of ours will do a far greater service in the cause of unity if, instead of trying to heal the wounds of centuries of dissent lightly by bringing about prematurely a coalescing of Orders, it preaches its Faith and upholds the banner of the Lord Jesus Christ with all the power of the Blessed Spirit. Preaching the truth in love, let us trust to Him Who said to the frightened Apostles, as their little ship shook and shivered and creaked before the onslaught of the waves on the Lake of Gennesaret, "How is it that ye are so fearful? Have ye not yet faith?" There is no other hope for the world today, sick with its doubts, mad after its pleasures which do not satisfy, and crazed into dishonesty and injustice by its greed for gold, than the living faith in Him Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary and was made man. Where men believe in Him there is unity, and in His own time and His own way He will lead His Church onward into peace.

APPENDED NOTE.

Are Bishops Essential to Valid Ordinations?

(The following extract from a review in the American Church Monthly for March, 1921, is reprinted as supplementing references in the preceding lecture, to Dr. Headlam's Bampton Lectures for 1920, The Doctrine of the Church and Re-union.)

THIS is a somewhat startling question. We had thought that point conceded amongst the scholarly theologians of the Church, Latin, Eastern, and Anglican. The teaching of our own formularies is that "no man shall be accounted a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said functions.... except he hath had Episcopal Consecration or Ordination." (Preface to the Ordinal, pg. 509.) But the author of the Bampton Lectures for 1920, Dr. A. C. Headlam, is obsessed with a theory which results in quite the contrary to this statement. "The final result," he says, "that has impressed itself upon my mind is that we have no sufficient justification for condemning the validity of any Orders which are performed with a desire to obey the commands of Christ and fulfill the intentions of the Apostles by prayer and the laying on of hands." This is sufficiently radical to make the churchman who has held Bishops to be necessary to the *esse* of the Church, not merely the *bene esse,* sit up with a shock. At the same time the non-conformist, e. g. a Congregationalist, smiles benignly and says, That has always been the congregationalist position. The situation is immediately reversed, however, when the Churchman and the Congregationalist listen to the completion of Dr. Headlam's statement. "On the other hand the Church rule of episcopal ordination, and the fact of the Apostolic Succession which has resulted from it, was in the past the great strength of Christian Unity, and the breaking of that rule has been one of the most fruitful causes of disunion. As a result of that conclusion I arrived at the practical solution of the question before us that reunion must come from the mutual recognition of Orders and Sacraments and the establishment of the Catholic rule of episcopacy and episcopal ordination for the future on a firm and regular foundation." (pg. ix.)

Here indeed is a striking out in two directions, a curious policy for one who claims to be working in the interests of getting the Protestant bodies back into the visible Unity of

the Church. Dr. Headlam in effect seems to say to Protestants,—"You did not suffer any essential loss when you lost the episcopate and drifted out of Catholic continuity. Your ordinations continued to be sufficient. Your sacramental rites are unimpaired. Nevertheless, now you must all, without exception, accept and maintain forever afterwards the episcopate and episcopal ordination." To those who have continuously insisted on the episcopate as of the *esse* of the Church, including no less than practically the entire Christian Church down to the sixteenth century and the Eastern, Latin, and Anglican Communions since and now, a mere bagatelle of witness whom the lecturer airily waves aside, he seems to say:—"All through these nineteen centuries you have been narrowly, rigidly, and mistakenly believing, acting, and teaching as though the Ministry of the Church was divinely instituted, and under the guidance of the Holy Ghost differentiated into a threefold Order. You were quite wrong. The Ministry of the Christian Body developed according to the practical wisdom of the human members of the Church. Episcopal ordination was only customary, not necessary, having not even authoritative traditional foundation. You must apologize to the whole world and to the bodies which have deliberately separated from Catholic Communion. Nevertheless, there cannot be any achievement and maintenance of Church Unity except by insisting without modification or exception upon the episcopal form of government and episcopal ordination." What a rapid and complete volte-face. Our protestant friends seize the weapon Dr. Headlam puts in their hands and at his suggestion deal Catholic Churchmen of all the Christian centuries a knock-down blow. Then as the latter crawl to their feet the same peaceably intentioned benefactor and infallible arbiter forces into their hands another bludgeon, and says, Go at them, knock them down, keep them down until they accept episcopacy and promise never again to say aught against it.

In reading the Bampton Lectures for 1920, the thought came into the mind, did Dr. Headlam read them over carefully and critically after they were ready to be delivered, or did the friends who "pointed out defects", refrain from calling attention to the amazing logical gymnastics of the argument, because they felt that would be to eliminate the personality altogether. For Dr. Headlam's method, which with unintentional satire he calls historical, is characterized by such slashing right and left as he drives his way through the surprised crowd who face him, that he leaves the field littered with corpses, nothing but corpses, whom he proposes later on to bring to life again by the magical medicine of his theory reduced to practice.

A concrete instance of the lecturer's rapid-fire tactics may

serve to put readers on their guard. And indeed one must scan every argument and every piece of evidence closely lest an untenable premise or assumption be allowed to slip in as an admissible member in the syllogism. "The Christian society," remarks Dr. Headlam, (pg. 42) "has grown from the development of certain great principles—discipleship, brotherhood, ministry, sacraments." That is a fine sentence, clever phrase-making. But it will not bear examination from the side of Christ's own illustrations, nor from Christian theology. The Christian society grows out of Christ Himself, the God-Man, the Crucified, Risen, Ascended, Reigning Jesus, Whose Vicegerent is God the Holy Ghost. The branches grow out of the Vine, not out of the soil. The plant does not grow out of the rich and fertile ground, the warmth of the sun, the refreshment of the rain, nor from the carefulness of the vinedresser. It grows from a root, a seed. These adjuncts aid and foster growth, but they are not the source of life. The Church is built upon Jesus Christ, the head Corner Stone, not upon His sayings even, much less upon abstract principles. The most perfect human discipleship, brotherhood, ministry, and sacraments, are not the seed and do not constitute the Christian Church. They are the outcome of Him Who is the Master of the disciples, the Head of the brotherhood and family, the Apostle and High Priest, the Bishop of souls, the Life within the sacraments. Dr. Headlam's descriptive definition is akin to Gibbon's five causes for the success of Christianity. One must go back of generalities and mere principles to find the source and rationale of Christianity. At another point in the lectures the figures of the vine and the body are elaborated but with the subtle intimation that there is co-operation between vine and branches, head and body, rather than that there is no existence, as branches and members, except in Him, The lecturer's doctrine of the Church seems not to recognize with clearness the work and operation of the Holy Ghost in the Church, as an abiding presence actively engaged in the task of inspiration and guidance. Also, the question of Vocation to the Ministry is confused with Ordination. "Christian thought did not argue that because a man was called by the Spirit to the work for which he was appointed there was no need of ordination, but it considered that he should be ordained because he was fitted, and the Church prayed that he might receive the necessary gifts. Such gifts must be continually renewed." Does Dr. Headlam hold that repetition of the laying on of hands is requisite from time to time? He certainly cannot get that out of the passages from the Pastoral Epistles. He might, however, fall back upon the theological position of the Eastern Church which regards the lapse into heresy or schism as nullifying the grace of episcopal ordination, necessitating a fresh ordination. But how would

his Protestant friends like the idea that because they are in schism the gifts conferred for their ministry have been nullified?

We are concerned not only to deal with some of the arguments employed in these lectures, but also to put readers on their guard against being carried along by the sweeping current of Dr. Headlam's style which is of a character not to allow any pause to examine, much less question, the landmarks along the shores of the Church's history. First of all, the reader must not allow himself to be captured by the naive criticism of all scholars who have reached conclusions other the lecturer's that they have been guilty of the *petitio principii,* or assuming what they wish to prove, while Dr. Headlam intends to employ the historical method. Dr. Headlam offends most blatantly against his own canons of investigation. Why, before the reader begins the first lecture Dr. Headlam has told him the thesis which he intends to prove, viz. "that we have no sufficient justification for condemning the validity of any Orders which are performed with a desire to obey the commands of Christ and fulfill the intentions of the Apostles by prayer and laying on of hands." He accuses Bishop Gore of assuming in his monumental work — The Church and the Ministry—"one of many theories of the ministry" and consequently "it is not altogether surprising that he is able to find what he desires." That is meant to settle Bishop Gore and get rid of his thorough and conservative scholarship, even though the Bishop indignantly points out in an open letter how he has been unfairly quoted and misrepresented. Dr. Moberly, Professor Turner, Dr. Hatch, and half a dozen others are in like fashion shouldered aside, and even Bishop Lightfoot is treated in patronizing fashion. Only Dr. Headlam remains as an unimpeachable authority. That is, with one exception mentioned in the preface, the late Dr. Harold Hamilton to whom Dr. Headlam pays the just tribute that "his death is a great loss to the cause of Christian theology and of Reunion." But the lecturer hints that Dr. Hamilton would, had he lived, have arrived at the same conclusion as Dr. Headlam. That is a surmise that should not be allowed to pass unchallenged. Does Dr. Headlam think none of us have read Dr. Hamilton's great work, *The People of God,* or that we shall not take it off our shelves in order to see what its conclusions are? Let us turn to see exactly what Dr. Hamilton does say, for Dr. Headlam does not quote Dr. Hamilton on the main thesis of the lectures, but only upon a subsidiary point. We shall take space to quote a single passage from Dr. Hamilton that readers may compare it with conclusions of the Bampton lecturer for 1920, noted hereafter. Also, we hope some will be induced to study Dr. Hamilton's book, a scholarly, not controversial, work.

"We should, then, conceive of the society of Christians as a single organism developing in history. It begins, when, on the day of Pentecost, body and soul were united, as it were, by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Twelve Apostles. Immediately it began to increase in size; new members are added; life and activity expand on every side; functions must be discharged and organs must be developed to discharge them. Although no individuals seem to have fully understood the whole significance of the fact, yet the organ which was developed to discharge the function of presiding at local celebrations of the Eucharist followed lines entirely different from all other organs. Certain individuals were put forward and received through the Apostles the sanction of the whole Church for their work of breaking the bread in memory of the Lord Jesus. These individuals came to be known as a special order to whom the right to preside at the Eucharist was universally recognized to be confined. Thus they became the organ of the whole Church for this purpose."

"And again, as time went on, it became necessary that other individuals should from time to time receive the same authorization to preside. To meet this need a further differentiation was developed. The Apostles authorized certain individuals to give authority to preside at the Eucharist. And these became, in the course of time, known as a special order, and the right to ordain was recognized universally as being confined to them. Thus by the second differentiation a second organ was developed. The earlier organ was known at first by the class name of 'bishop' or 'presbyter'. Later on 'bishop' was appropriated to designate a member of the second or ordaining organ. Thus the twofold ministry is the organ of the whole Church for the celebration of the Holy Communion. The bread which they break and the cup which they bless is the communion of the whole Church, is the Body and Blood of Christ." (People of God, II., pg. 204. Cf. II, pg. 170.)

A second warning is to beware of the lecturer's cleverness in trying to draw his readers aside from the main line of the discussion. How clever, but how mal-apropos, to sneer at "Apostolic Succession as ordinarily taught in the Church of England" and to characterize it as "mechanical and unreal" because he "could not see any marked superiority—often, in fact, there seemed to be a real inferiority—in the spiritual life and capacity of our clergy, and Anglicanism, though extraordinarily attractive to me, seemed often to fail in life and effectiveness." This sneer, whether with or without foundation, has nothing to do with the issue in question.

Then Dr. Headlam has recourse to the same position which characterized Puritanism in the times of Richard Hooker and which was answered with such telling strength and cogency by that thorough scholar. Dr. Headlam seems to be driven

to that untenable position and exploded theory, that nothing is to be required as authoritative in the Christian Church which is not explicitly set forth in Holy Scripture. Hence such unsupported statements as that Christ "established ministry, but gave no order for the appointment of ministers." How does Dr. Headlam know that? Clement of Rome suggests, at least, the contrary. The latter is quoted in the familiar passage:—"Having then received commands and being fully assured through the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and being confirmed in the word of God with full assurance of the Holy Ghost..... they appointed their first fruits, having tested them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons (probably the two lower orders) to them that should believe." This affords a piece of evidence antagonistic to our lecturer's sweeping generality, but he proceeds to get rid of any and all scholarly interpretations of St. Clement which favor the theory that "the later rule of the Church already prevailed," by declaring, "all this is guess-work and we cannot build up evidence of Apostolic custom by guess-work." That is a short and easy way of dealing with evidence that makes against one's own position. But the same eagerness to impugn scholarly interpretations does not prevent the lecturer, for his own purposes, from making such wild statements, without any presentation of evidence, as the following:—"It must be further remembered that in the ordination of priests, it is the priests, with the bishop as president, that perform the ceremony and not the bishop alone." This is a gross distortion of the meaning of the joining with the Bishop, at his laying on of hands, by priests present. The latter in their action signify the assent of the second order of the Ministry, not that presbyters are organs for transmitting the grace of ordinations. The Bishop, and he alone, is essential to ordination and the very passage quoted by Dr. Headlam in a footnote is evidence to that point. Or again, he repeats the allegation which cannot be proved as done by the action and with the full knowledge and assent of the Church of England, viz. that "previous to the year 1660, on certain occasions those who were not in Episcopal Orders but had been ordained in a Reformed Church, were admitted to benefices." Notice that in this assertion he implies that such persons, if any, discharge the spiritual functions of the priesthood, although admission to benefices may mean only the temporalities of the benefice. Such cases may possibly have been, but the few instances alleged of the priestly functions performed without episcopal ordination and with the direct knowledge and consent of proper ecclesiastical authority break down or remain not proven under careful examination. Dr. Headlam must know that his statement is questionable. The same is true of the succeeding assertion, that "in the

Prayer Book of 1661, as a result of the reaction against the Commonwealth, and as a part of the policy which deprived those in Presbyterian Orders in English benefices, it was definitely stated that none might hold office in the Church of England unless he had received Episcopal ordination or consecration." This statement was inserted to meet a condition which had never existed before the Commonwealth, and to make clear that the Church of England held the ancient and Catholic doctrine of the Ministry, not that it was adopting a new practice.

Investigations have been made by careful students of the period with the result of showing that no evidence exists to back up such loose assertions as that quoted above.

It was necessary to adduce instances that Dr. Headlam is guilty of violating his own canons of historical inquiry. Consequently the reader should accept nothing unsupported by proper evidence and references to documentary authorities and a scholarly consensus of interpretation. A strong case has no need to slur over important points as though there were not two sides.

When the Bampton Lectures have been carefully considered two theses stand out as of weight and moment in the lecturer's arguments and as of great significance if they could be established. We shall briefly consider them to see whether they are tenable, that is, whether their correctness is so unimpeachable that they may be used in the terms of a syllogism.

I. The postulate is laid down that Apostolic Succession (which as Dr. Headlam states, or misstates it, is a "man of straw", not the real position of Catholic theology) is merely a mechanical or magical and quite unreal doctrine. He denies that the Succession is bound up with due transmission of power. He confines transmission to succession in office, the right, apart from the power, to perform the functions of the office of Bishop. He sees no more than that the occupant of an episcopal chair is accredited as being its lawful occupant and so to be the due successor. Now ordination means that and a great deal more. It is true that due appointment and ordination qualify for the seat in the Bishop's place and that continuity demands such due procedure, in which the Church through laity and clergy have a share. We have an illustration ready at hand in successions to the papal office. No more than due election and recognition are requisite for discharging papal functions. There is no consecration necessary, except to the episcopate. If the Pope-elect be already a Bishop he is simply enthroned. If he be not a Bishop as yet, he may still discharge papal functions, and cases are adducible when this has been done. An English Bishop-elect or designate, having sued out his civil rights, may discharge the

temporalities of his see before consecration. But in neither of these cases are spiritual functions included. Neither the Pope-elect or the Bishop-elect may exercise episcopal functions of ordaining or consecrating others.

By a specious and a little too clever confusing of cases and evidence Dr. Headlam appears to get rid of anything but transmission of office. He ignores, or minimizes to a vanishing point, the correlative matter of the transmission of spiritual grace or power. Moreover he repeats in effect, even if he does not himself accept, the misunderstanding so common amongst protestant objectors to episcopacy, as to the method of transmission. This misapprehension acts upon the erroneous assumption that the Head of the Church, Jesus Christ, the "Shepherd and Bishop of souls", is infinitely or immeasureably removed from the Church on earth, instead of being "present all the days". The teaching as to transmission of grace is assumed to mean that the grace flows through a channel which reaches back through lines of Bishops to the first century and the Upper Room. Thus the source is felt to be further and further removed. But that is not the true teaching as to the transmission and receipt of the Grace of Holy Order. Our Lord Jesus Christ, as even Dr. Headlam admits, is really present at the administration of every Sacrament and He acts then and there through His own accredited representative, the Bishop, in ordaining, and the priest in consecrating the Eucharist, blessing, absolving, and (normally) baptizing. The succession in office and the transmission of the power to act for Christ in conferring gifts are two parts of the order of procedure which on the Church's side are inseparable. Christ works by His own appointed instruments, empowered continuously by the Holy Spirit guiding His Church. I cannot but feel that Dr. Headlam realizes that he is distorting things, but that his argument gains by magnifying one side of a truth and minimizing the other. He does that again and again until one gets to be sure that the point of evidence he ignores or disclaims is just what he is afraid will weaken his case.

Just in line with this feature of his discussion is the emphasis upon the writings of St. Augustine of Hippo. This is not the first time that the African Father has been detached from the Church and its theologians and made to furnish the grounds for a novel system. Martin Luther and John Calvin both appealed to St. Augustine, the former to find basis for Justification by Faith only, the latter to get some foundation for his doctrine of Predestination and Election. All who rest their case for novelties in doctrine upon St. Augustine ignore the fact that the great Doctor of Grace left mainly controversial works, not constructive theology. They also forget that St. Augustine did not depart from the Catholic Church

Order in his own procedure. When an advocate of a theory has to resort to a glaring species of *non sequitur* in order to get evidence, we are not so much impressed with his fairness, as with his cleverness, and cleverness sometimes comes dangerously near a *suppressio veri.* The glaring instance is the quotation from St. Augustine of a passage which the lecturer mistranslates, as is evident from the Latin of the passage in the foot-note. He argues from his inaccurate translation that Bishops are not necessary. The passage really states only that "we can be saved if we are not Bishops or priests, but we cannot be saved without becoming Christians." It is absolutely indispensable to Dr. Headlam's scheme for restoration of Christian Unity to get rid of episcopal ordination as a necessity. Consequently he endeavors to make his readers swallow his assertion, to state it in brief, that episcopal ordination is only customary and not essential. He lays it down as unquestionable that laying on of hands and prayer with a right intention alone are the essentials. He would have "the fullest and freest recognition, as a condition of reunion, of the Orders and Sacraments of all those who have been ordained in accordance with the Apostolic rule with prayer and laying on of hands, and who have celebrated the Sacraments according to the command of our Lord." Yet he brings no more than presumptive evidence of a very weak and individualistic kind to back up his contention. He is palpably ignoring certain facts when he argues that the Roman Church and the Anglican alike, as well as the Eastern, do not consider ordination by Bishops essential because in the discussion which resulted in the Bull of Leo XIII no assertion was made that the only true minister of ordination was a Bishop. Why of course not, for that was the very point as to which there was absolutely no controversy. The question was not, who is the proper minister, but, are our English Bishops proper Bishops because episcopally ordained with the proper Form and Matter. Surely Dr. Headlam is a great deal too ingenuous here for his reputation as a straightforward scholar.

His sole argument is that the fruits of Sacraments are to be observed in non-episcopal Christian bodies. That is a popular line to take, and whatever validity it has, it is capable of being pressed so as to prove quite too much. For Jews, Mahometans, Unitarians, Ethical Culturists, almost any individuals, can be brought forward to exhibit certain natural virtues, like kindheartedness, generosity, happiness, but these are not identical with the supernatural fruit of the Spirit. This argument may be corroborative, but certainly is not direct evidence. The whole passage on the non-essentiality of ordination by Bishops is unconvincing because of the utter lack of positive evidence in the teaching and practice of the Church.

We need say no more in order to indicate the points and method on which the lecturer's train of argument is to be stoutly challenged. Many, who are anxious to get rid of the episcopate as of the *esse* of the Church, will seize eagerly upon Dr. Headlam's book and boldly state that its deductions are final and conclusive. We have heard already of one rector of a parish who proclaimed to his congregation that Dr. Headlam had finally settled the question and that episcopal ordination can no longer be considered necessary. But scholars do not feel that Dr. Headlam has proved his case. Quite the contrary. His hypotheses remain unsupported by sufficient direct evidence and the verdict in the case of most of them is —*not proven.* Hence his conclusions are still in suspense.

2.

The Theology of the Anglo-Catholic Congress

"Its sound is gone out into all lands and its words into the ends of the world."

THE happy and inspiring task is undertaken by me of capturing and interpreting to you the spirit and witness of the great Anglo-Catholic Congress of 1920 in its theological utterances. The sessions of the Congress came to an end on July 2, when, in the dusk of an English twilight, eight hundred priests and a score of Bishops—English, American, and Colonial—knelt under the shadow of S. Saviour's Cathedral, Southwark, to utter a fervent Nunc Dimittis and to receive the blessing of the beloved Bishop of S. Albans. But the work of the Congress was not over. It had simply reached the end of the first stage. It is still going on.

The twelve hundred priests who had joined in the great corporate act of eucharistic worship at S. Alban's Church, Holborn, at the opening of the Congress are scattered now; the fifteen hundred Masses offered day by day and the thousands of communicants who morning after morning thronged the Altars of London Churches, together with the vast number of priests and laity outside London and even England, to join in intercession for God's blessing upon the Congress, have returned to their usual Church life. But that mighty agency of prayer which they set in motion is not checked nor stayed.

The Albert Hall is emptied of the thousands who came daily to express their unswerving loyalty to the Catholic Faith. The great volume of their voices, "like the sound of many waters" lifted in hymn and Creed and Pater Noster and Ave Maria, has died away on earth, but the witness of their worship still is clear and strong.

The missionary offering, the fruit and expression of zeal, self-denial, and enthusiasm for the extension of the Catholic Faith, is beginning now that glorious work which will go on like the waves of the ocean with results to be known in full

only when Christ comes at the end of the world to garner the harvest of souls.

But the case is somewhat different with the theological utterances enshrined in the papers read at the great mass meetings in the Albert Hall. These papers constituted the witness to the world of that which underlay the animus of the Congress—the positive, constructive statement of the Catholic Faith for which Anglo-Catholics unflinchingly and unreservedly stand. Many listened to these papers. The majority, undoubtedly, grasped their drift. A considerable number will read the collected report of these clear-voiced utterances. But it is highly desirable that the largest possible number should be enabled to hear and read at least some of the words which were spoken at the foot of the great Crucifix on the platform of Albert Hall.

My task, then, is to select, combine, and mould the witness borne by the writers to the end that many may be able to "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest" what these scholars and thinkers, loyal sons of the Church, convinced and practicing Catholics, contributed to the theology of the Congress, into a definite and edifying whole.

First, let us take some account of the public sessions, the programs, and the speakers. Five regular sessions were held in the Albert Hall, supplemented by two evening sessions at which certain papers were repeated, and by a final mass meeting of a less formal nature to consider the relation of the Church to industrial questions. Each meeting in Albert Hall was presided over by a Bishop as Chairman. There were twenty regular, appointed speakers on assigned topics. From the abundance of English theological scholars of the highest rank the difficulty lay in making a selection. The program committee with admirable judgment made such choice as to indicate that Anglo-Catholic scholarship is not confined to any one University, nor to any one type of mind. Oxford and Cambridge, as well as a Scottish University—St. Andrew's—were represented. And with what a remarkable personel! Papers on two of the most difficult and delicate subjects for treatment—The Sacrifice of the Altar and The Roman Catholic Church—were fearlessly presented by two Deans of Cambridge Colleges. University Professors were numerous, and included the older and younger men, e. g. Dr. Darwell Stone,

foremost of our authorities in Dogmatic Theology, and Rev. N. P. Williams, the Catholic champion against German theology in the published open correspondence with the late Dr. Sanday. The lead in the order of appearance on the platform was taken by laymen, Professor Cuthbert Turner, second to none as an authority on all subjects relating to the early Church; and Professor Taylor, equally high in the realm of philosophical theology; while Mr. Gilbert Chesterton, journalist by profession and wit and master of paradox by nature, along with Mr. Moore, a laboring man and President of the Silvertown Branch of the Rubber Workers Union, balanced these scholars at the concluding session and held their own. The Superior General of the S. S. J. E., Fr. Henry P. Bull, well-known and beloved on this side of the Atlantic, and the Superior of the Community of the Resurrection, Fr. Frere, the liturgiologist, historian, and expert in matters pertaining to the Eastern Church, with Fr. Thornton, author of a brilliant work—Conduct and the Supernatural—and Fr. Keble Talbot, represented the Religious Orders. Busy parish priests, such as Fr. Underhill, Vicar of the famous parish in the slums of Birmingham, St. Albans', soon to be amongst us in New York, and Fr. Rawlinson, curate at St. Barnabas', Pimlico and also attached to the staff of the Church Times and an expert on modern French theology, were among the lecturers, together with men of the deepest devotional power, skilled as conductors of Retreats, and spiritual directors, such as Fr. Briscoe and Fr. Hockley. Not least, the Bishops were magnificently represented by Dr. Charles Gore, lately Bishop of Oxford, the Bishop of Zanzibar, the Bishop of Zululand who lighted the torch of enthusiasm which resulted in the fifty thousand pounds missionary offering, and the Bishops of Salisbury and St. Alban's as preachers at the opening and closing services.

And these speakers, one and all, are first and always devout and practicing Catholics with an experimental acquaintance and long-standing knowledge of Catholic faith and practice, speaking not the language of indefiniteness and hesitancy, but of truth and conviction. They did not discover the truth. It has been revealed to them by GOD the Holy Ghost through the Church. And they have found that the intellect is satisfied and the restless heart finds rest in the Catholic Faith. Their trumpet cannot give an uncertain

sound. They are priests who are before the Altar daily, some of them University dons, members of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd in Cambridge who meet together daily for Eucharist and Office and whose early guide and counsellor was Fr. Figgis, or members of one of the Religious Orders who place the spiritual life first, or parish priests who have taught their people that the Eucharist is the heart and centre of the Christian life. This fact explains their calm certainty. They are not seeking for the truth. They have found it in the Divine Jesus. It is expressed and operating in His mystical Body, the Church.

Then it is an outstanding characteristic in these papers that there is no compromise, nor confusing of opinion with belief. There is no timid apologizing for being Catholics, no watering down by such phrases as—"one may perhaps be permitted to think,"—or, "it is permissible to hold." Their language is fashioned rather after that which bears the name of Athanasius—"This is the Catholic Faith." Yet at the same time they speak with intellectual humility in the spirit of St. Peter whose conviction was commended by his Master—"Blessed art thou for flesh and blood hath not revealed it, but My Father in heaven." And they show not the slightest desire to be told that they will be allowed to hold their peculiar views in the Church of England. Their constant attitude is—*This is Catholic truth and always has been held. Consequently, this is the Faith of the Church of England.*

With these preliminary considerations let us turn now to inquire what were the theological positions taken by the Congress papers in matters of essential importance. Time fails us to consider each paper by itself or to make copious extracts. The utmost that is advisable is to arrange constructively under a few heads the teaching of the Congress.

I. What were the Avowed Aims of the Anglo-Catholic Congress?

The main aims of the Congress were stated as follows: "To bring men and women to a true realisation of our Lord Jesus Christ as their personal Saviour and King, to extend the knowledge of Catholic Faith and Practice at home and abroad as a means of promoting a right relation to God, the demonstration of the right place of Catholicism within the English Church." Again, "The purpose of the Congress is to wit-

ness to the Love of God, manifested in the Incarnation, and bestowed upon us by the Spirit, in the faith and order of the Catholic Church. We desire to make it plain that as Catholics we have one supreme object, to exalt the Name of Jesus; and if we insist, on the importance of ecclesiastical discipline, of Catholic ceremonial, of dogmatic orthodoxy, we do so in order that we may safeguard our central treasure, and promote the sovereignty and honour of our Divine Lord." The Bishop of Salisbury declared, in the opening sermon, in approval of the Congress, "I believe you are right to hold this Congress. I know that it is not meant to be an armed demonstration, or a controversial challenge, or an attempt to take some desired position by storm, or to gain some advantage hitherto denied you, or to bring pressure to bear upon another assembly... but that you are here to close up your own ranks.... You are assured that your rightful place is where God has placed you, ministering at the altars of the English Church, where you are free to declare the whole counsel of God..... and to indicate the spiritual character of the Church which at this moment is in jeopardy, and which no State interference, no chilling erastianism, can ever be allowed to impair."

To account for the wonderful accord amongst the writers of the papers, it is explained that—"The papers are the outcome of a common faith. They express what the writers believe to be the truth which God has revealed and has made to be the indestructible heritage of the Catholic Church. As Catholics the writers desired to be a mouthpiece through which may be declared what they have learned from the Church, their Mother."

II. The Position of the Congress on the Church and the Faith.

The position is fearlessly taken that we need not be practically disturbed by the innumerable discussions concerning the exact connotation of the term—The Kingdom, and the phrases—The Kingdom of God and Kingdom of heaven. "Since the Day of Pentecost", says the brilliant young scholar, Fr. Thornton, C. R., "the primary embodiment of the Kingdom of God has been in the Catholic Church, because in her lies its principle resources. There are two distinct elements which appear to be necessary in any adequate idea of the

Kingdom of God. First, there is the sovereign inward rule of God in the individual hearts and characters of men, and secondly, there is an external order and process whereby human society is visibly redeemed and transformed... Now these different elements of the Kingdom actually made their appearance as realized facts in the Apostolic Church.... The Catholic Church received from our Lord the keys of the Kingdom of heaven. In her are established the well-springs of grace through His indwelling Spirit. By these alone can man be united to God, renewed in his nature, and made responsive to the divine claims upon his life. The Church thus possesses the secret of personal character, the vital power by which the Kingdom grows." Fr. Thornton goes on to point out that the first and most important of "the principles by which the Church's vocation as organ of the Kingdom must be realized in the world is the distinction between the Church and the world." It has always been a deep-rooted Christian conviction that there can be no finality about any outward ordering of the world, and that the final reign of God and the saints belongs to a life which shall be ushered in after this world has run its course. But that other world not only reaches forward beyond the stretch of time which measures this earthly process. It also surrounds us now; and it is this which distinguishes Christian activity from worldly activity ... The one seeks supernatural ends, the other some worldly achievement. Renunciation of earth for heaven is the primary mark of the Christian, determining the relation of the Church to the world..... Christianity is essentially revolutionary, aspiring, progressive; whereas paganism, ancient or modern, accepts life as an already completed whole, and is mainly concerned to maintain a *status quo.* In the heart of man there is an ever recurring fatalism which makes him bow down before the sovereignty of seemingly inevitable processes... This fatalism is the hall-mark of the pagan life, which has the sentence of death upon it. Its typical civilization stagnates and stands still in rigid grooves of caste and permanent inequalities... Catholicism at its best always stands for a common social life, whereas the whole structure of the modern world spells irresponsible individualism. Catholicism stands for the redemption of the whole life of man under Christian ideals, whereas the modern world took its rise from the re-

vival of semi-pagan ideals in the Renaissance... being greatly aided in this false emancipation by the Protestant principle that religion consists solely in personal piety." Fr. Thornton's paper is a magnificent apologetic for the Catholic as opposed to the Protestant conception of the Church. He sees the justification of Creeds because "in the earlier centuries the Church conserved the Catholic dogmas at the very time when her way of life was a revolutionary challenge to the existing social order. The dogmas were conserved because they themselves are the source of that new wine of revolution which is to bring in the Kingdom of God."

But will Catholic dogma bear the test of modern criticism? Yes, says Professor Turner. "Religion is just that department of life where we feel most keenly the need of what is permanent and unchanging... And if the Church is the Body of Christ, then some reflection of the unchanging Lord must be found in its unchanging faith and life.... We are met together to testify our conviction that continuity and stability are the essential basis of the life of the Christian Society, that the one Church is prior to all its diverse and local and partial manifestations, that the multitude of the disciples can make some rightful claim over the single disciple, that the full endowment of sacramental gifts is poured by the Spirit of Christ upon His Body, and mediated to individuals through the hands of an Apostolic Ministry." He pays a tribute to the Tractarian fathers who "threw the whole weight of their learning and their spiritual power into the appeal to history, to the doctrine and practice of the primitive Church." And he emphasizes the fact that the outcome of the process of critical inquiry has been that "the accuracy of ecclesiastical tradition as to the documents which embody the record of Christian origins has in the main been signally vindicated" and that "the soundest English scholarship had never been carried away by the current which swept Continental theologians off their feet." Then this critical scholar of the highest rank proceeds to deal with the critical attacks upon the article of the Creeds—"The third day He rose again". He asserts that "unless we discredit S. Paul as a witness, we cannot refuse his definite testimony to the things most surely believed among the earliest disciples. That this primitive creed included not only the Death and Resurrection of Christ, but

also the Burial, can only have been for the purpose of making it clear that He who was buried rose with that Body in which He had been laid in that tomb. If these early Christians had only meant to assert that the Spirit survived the death of the Body, it was superfluous to mention the Burial, and misleading to mention the Third Day. But they meant that not only was the Spirit not extinguished, but that the Body too, though it lay three days in the tomb, was on the third day triumphantly raised..... The Creed rests on the concordant testimony of all our earliest witnesses. No scrap of evidence can be found to suggest that there ever was a stage of Christian belief which did not express itself in the clause — *tertia die resurrexit a mortuis.* This is the faith of the Church: to us there is no other."

But are not modern philosophy and speculation playing havoc with the Creeds? Professor Taylor, a philosopher of recognized eminence, admits that the atheistic philosophy of the present day is not intellectually negligible, and that "it is a well-knit, compact, coherent body of thought, utterly hostile to the presuppositions of the interior Christian life," and that "it is anything but easy to find the weak spots in its armor." He emphasizes the subtle infusion into the minds of the young that all the Christian values have been overthrown and says the situation is serious and bids us avoid the fault of impatience if we would work out a philosophy for Christians. "We must not assume that a speculation is true because it has the weight of an illustrious name behind it, or because it is ancient and has not so far been called in question, or because it is very new and has up till now never been thought of by anyone." What we must do is to remember that "if we would be truly catholic-minded, we must remember that Creeds, devotions, and externals derive from and express, a hidden inner life of the Christian community. It creates them; they do not create it. There was a living Catholic Church on the Day of Pentecost before one article of the simplest creed had been formulated; and it was because the Church with its life and active faith was there first that creeds came to be made. Most refreshingly he adds that "our Lord's promises are all to the Church, or community of believers, and that the Apostolic writers know nothing of a 'Christianity outside the Church'."

III. What the Congress said on Unity.

Undoubtedly one of the most important and interesting subjects was that which dealt with questions of unity and the relation between our Communion and the Eastern and Roman Communions. And our position was clearly and definitely stated, with courtesy and fairness, and an utter absence of bitterness or offensive phariseeism. There was even a dry humor in some of the remarks.

Rev. N. P. Williams employed a novel allegory to illustrate the question of authority, in which he compared the Catholic Faith to a map, of all existing maps the only one that would bring the ship of the Church safe to the haven where it would be. The mariner would find other maps imperfect. The Jewish maps would be found to contain features which are fifteen hundred years out of date. "He would find that the other Christian maps consisted largely of negations; and that so far as they contained any positive information at all, they were merely pared down versions of this, the oldest and most complete map. Some of these maps, especially those of German manufacture, were rapidly fading in the keen sea air, owing to some defect of ink or paper; some had in fact already become, like the Bellman's map, 'a perfect and absolute blank'. A patient, candid, unprejudiced survey of the actually existing maps would, we claim, be enough to invest the supposition, that the Catholic map is the true one, with a high degree of probability; and if the voyager were to make an honest and manful attempt to get into touch with the owner of the ship by means of the wireless of prayer, there would be no doubt at all that the probability would very soon for him be turned into certainty."

Mr. Williams continues, "We stand for the principle of an authority of a deposit of fundamental Christian ideas, promulgated by Christ our Lord, committed by Him to the guardianship of the Catholic Church, and implicitly or explicitly contained in the Holy Scriptures; for the belief that the historic development of Christian doctrine was so guided and inspired by the heavenly assistance of the Holy Ghost that the Catholic Creeds and conciliar definitions may be relied upon as representing the nearest approach to absolute truth which finite minds are capable of apprehending.... In

all popular exposition of the subject of authority we must be careful never to isolate the Church from the living Christ Who is her Spouse and Head, and must make it plain that loyalty to Church teaching is only claimed as being one aspect of loyalty to our divine Lord."

Mr. Williams finds that "in connection with the question of doctrinal authority the term — the Church — means the totality of normal baptized persons, those who constitute the concrete, historical society which is visibly and externally continuous with the community founded by Christ." In answer to the inquiry—"Where and what is the Church in this sense," he replies, "the Church East and West before 1054;" and declares that there is "a perfectly definite and coherent body of information about God, man, our destiny in the next world, and the way of salvation in this. And there is no reasonable doubt as to what was taught by the undivided Catholic Church before 1054."

He has a sly hit at papal infallibility. Anyone who wants to hear the "living voice," he says, "has only to hire a taxi some Sunday morning, and time his movements in such a way that he can assist at the Nicene Creed in English at S. Paul's, in Latin at Westminster Cathedral, and in Greek in the Greek Church at Bayswater."

The question of our relations with the Roman Church was dealt with by one of the ablest of the rising generation of scholars and thinkers, Rev. E. M. Milner-White, Dean of King's College, Cambridge. He finds seven points of common ground already existing between Canterbury and Rome—unity of history, unity of faith, unity of worship, unity of fruits, unity of Holy Order, unity of outlook and atmosphere, and unity in the Communion of Saints. To the taunt that Rome has slammed the door he replies, "It is not in Rome's power to slam and bolt this door." He points to two sets of differences and finds neither of them hopeless. First, there are theological differences "which pivot upon the claim of infallibility and autocracy by the primatial See of the West. Secondly, there is a difference of genius and general ideal between the two bodies. He declares that the main obstacles to re-union with Rome, that we can deal with, lie within our own body. "It is of first importance to unify our own communion, on a demonstrably Catholic basis, however simple

and unelaborate. Secondly we must have reasonableness and patience in moderating our chronic disorder, while thirdly, we must teach unweariedly. Looking back over the past seventy-five years he observes that "The battle for the Blessed Sacrament has been almost won; a deep devotional life centres round the weekly, nay, the daily Altar. The battle for the Sacrament of Penance has been half won." "Our contribution to unity with Rome," he says, "will be, to establish here, in the United States, and in the Dominions, a true and deep Catholicism, deliberately chosen by a thinking and educated people as the most loving and reasonable form of Christ's religion; a tolerant Catholicism, ready and eager to marry again in the Church of S. Peter, when Rome is convinced."

In dealing with our relations with "other Christian bodies" the Rev. G. H. Clayton, of Cambridge, remarked, "We all desire to be in one body with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth; but we believe that the historic Church is His Body and we cannot but regard the principles which have guided the Church from the earliest times as having His authority. But we are bound to be loyal to Him; and that fundamental loyalty to Him prevents us from contemplating the possibility of a reunion which is false to the underlying principles of Catholic order;" He admits that some of the criticisms upon the Church of England are valid and advocates strongly disestablishment, and that the Church thus freed should have the power of excluding such as will not accept her discipline or submit to her interpretation of the teaching of our Lord.

In stating the witness of the English Church, the Chaplain of Liddon House, Rev. C. S. Gillett, condemned in severe terms the theory of a national religion which should be (at any given moment of the nation's life) the aggregate of the national qualities at their highest —the character of the Englishman at his best; likewise the assumption that a religion can become non-doctrinal and remain Christian. He dwelt upon the intellectual witness of the English Church, and in a fine passage claims that she stands for "the Faith as a reasonable philosophy of life, as a scheme of doctrine capable of intellectual apprehension and defence. She has no terror of modern learning, no fear to encourage the most industrious

and penetrating research in the field of history, or psychology, or metaphysics, and indeed even in the field of theology itself..... She is not afraid; for she knows that Catholic truth, given a fair and open field, will always conquer."

IV. What was said on the Sacraments.

Leaving the doctrine of the Church, the program of the Congress enters upon the subject of Corporate Religion and the Sacraments. Two subjects were appointed for special consideration—The Sacrifice of the Altar and The Reserved Sacrament.

The writer on the former subject, the Dean of Pembroke College, Cambridge University, Rev. C. J. Smith, presses with remarkable conciseness the point on which the whole question hinges. "The reality of the Sacrifice is a direct consequence of the sacramental Presence of our Lord." Reviewing the doctrine in the history of the Church, he says, "It is a fact which, I suppose, no one will question, that from the earliest times the Church has regarded the Holy Eucharist as being *in some sense* at any rate a sacrifice. Evidence that this was the case is found in the earliest Christian writings outside the limits of the New Testament Canon..... When we pass to the third century the sacrificial language becomes more definite and more frequent. Tertullian, early in the century, uses such words as 'sacrifice', 'priest', and 'altar', in a Christian sense, and further refers to the Christian custom of offering oblations on behalf of the departed on the anniversaries of their deaths; in the writings of St. Cyprian, who immediately follows him, 'sacrifice' is the ordinary designation of the Eucharist, and the sacrificial idea reaches a remarkable clearness of expression. Thus from the earliest times the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist was everywhere recognized and accepted throughout the whole Church, while from the time of St. Cyprian onwards the allusions to it become so frequent, both in the writings of the Fathers and in the ancient Liturgies, as to make further quotations unnecessary. It was not indeed made the subject of discussion or detailed explanation; rather it was everywhere taken for granted; and this continued to be so throughout the history of the undivided Church—and indeed until the Reformation period."

"We have then in this sacrificial view of the Eucharist an unquestioned part of the tradition of the universal Church, and the beginnings of it at least can be traced back to the sub-Apostolic age. But we may go even further and say that these beginnings can be traced back even to the pages of the New Testament itself. However we are to interpret the words, "We have an altar," in Hebrews xiii. 10, it is scarcely possible to exclude from the passage all thought of the Eucharist, and of the Eucharist as a feast upon a sacrifice."

"The Prayer Book* in its final form, with its dislocated Canon, does indeed obscure the sacrificial aspect of the Mass; it by no means denies it. The Articles, which might so easily have been made to deny the sacrifice altogether, had it been so desired, were in fact carefully worded so as to reject only such theories of the sacrifice as might seem to imply some defect in the sacrifice of the Cross, or to encourage mechanical views of the multiplication of Masses and of the application of their benefits."

"Not only did the English Church not repudiate Catholic standards, she definitely claimed to maintain them; in the preface to her Prayer Book she professes to stand for 'the doctrine and practice of the whole Catholic Church of Christ'. Through the violence of reaction and the influence of foreign Protestantism she lost sight of her own ideals, and hitherto to a large extent has failed to realise them. We are here today because we believe that she has it in her to realize them yet: the aim of the Catholic is to endeavor to help her to do so. And as in other matters so with regard to the sacrifice of the altar, we want her to know the greatness of her inheritance. We believe that she has, and has always had, even when she has been least conscious of it, the true sacrifice of the Mass, for the sacrifice depends on a valid consecration by a valid priesthood, not upon man's understanding of it or the perfection of its liturgical expression; but we want her to know that she has it, and to offer the Holy Sacrifice with full consciousness of what she does."

"The chief points of the doctrine are sufficiently clear. The central truth is this: the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice, because the bread and wine therein set forth upon the altar

*The reference here is to the English Prayer Book; the service-books of the American and Scottish Churches are more explicit.

become, by an unspeakable mystery, the Body and Blood of Christ. That is the truth which differentiates what we may rightly call the Catholic doctrine from that purely metaphorical use of sacrificial language which has so often done duty for the Catholic doctrine among Anglican theologians. The reality of the sacrifice is a direct consequence of the reality of the sacramental Presence of our Lord. The oblations of bread and wine which we offer at the offertory become, by virtue of their consecration, an oblation infinitely greater: become, we believe, not knowing how, the Body and Blood of Christ Himself; we offer, then, the Body and Blood of Christ, a true and proper sacrifice because they are the Body and Blood of Him Who is the perfect Sacrifice. Those other points which the Church has emphasized about the sacrifice, its connection with the sacrifice of Calvary, its union with the heavenly intercession, are in fact but different aspects of this central truth. Offering the Body and Blood of Christ, we offer Christ Himself—Christ who died, who rose, who lives,—in all the fulness of His sacrificial efficacy."

The writer concludes his able paper by suggesting three reasons why Catholics should especially desire and work for the fuller recognition of the sacrifice of the altar. "First, we should desire it because we believe it to be a truth revealed to us by God in His Word and in His Church and as such we cannot be content to see it neglected. If our Lord has given us this way of presenting His sacrifice, and of claiming and obtaining the application of its merits, we ought to avail ourselves of it to the full and not to doubt its efficacy as a means of advancing God's kingdom in the world, in the Church, and in individual souls, in this life and in the life beyond the grave. Secondly, because in these days there is a tendency in some quarters to make little of the atoning sacrifice of our Lord and Saviour, perhaps in part due to past neglect of its perpetual memorial at the altar. We, as Catholics, believe in that atoning sacrifice; we believe, too, that men need it, little as they may be conscious of their need. In the sacrifice of the altar we have the appointed way in which the sacrifice of Calvary is to be 'proclaimed' before men, and the appointed way in which those who are brought to know their need of it may find their need supplied. Lastly, the due recognition of the sacrifice of the altar will help to give a right direction to

the whole religion of our English Church. Is it not true that for long our English religion has been in the main self-centered? And may not that, too, be largely due to neglect of the sacrifice of the altar? So long as the central act of Christian devotion is thought of only or principally as a means of receiving, so long will religion be centered upon self. But let that central act be recognized as an act of worship and offering and sacrifice, and Christian life, which draws its inspiration and its power from the altar, will more and more become a life which is offered, a life which is made a living sacrifice, a life whose object is not self but God."

In the paper on The Reserved Sacrament, Rev. G. A. Michell, the Warden of St. Stephen's House, Oxford, with abundant references to sources, states that "as early as the second century of our era, occasional references are found to the practice of reserving the Blessed Sacrament, by the beginning of the third it was undoubtedly an established custom. Historically, therefore, Reservation is on the same level as Infant Baptism. The evidence for the one is as early, as plentiful, and as authoritative as the other."

"Somewhat startling," he continues, "in view of modern usage, is the fact that for some centuries the laity freely reserved the Sacrament in their own homes, and communicated themselves as need arose. In later times regulations gradually came into force by which Reservation was confined to Churches, and the administration of the Sacrament to the clergy. But the earlier custom is evidence of the layman's right of access to the Sacrament, and the later regulation imposes a corresponding obligation on the clergy to satisfy the full needs which the laity can no longer satisfy themselves."

"But to provide communion for the absent was not held to exhaust the blessings made available by the Reserved Sacrament. Just as when Liturgies came to be formed, Christian piety seized the opportunity to surround the central ceremonies of consecration and communion with other acts of devotion — with intercession, adoration, thanksgiving and the like — so also Christian piety was not slow to find edifying uses for the Reserved Sacrament subsidiary to the main purpose of communion."

The writer then goes on to speak of the *Eulogiae*, or consecrated Hosts, sent by Bishops of different dioceses to one

another, to express the unity of the Church throughout the world, and later the use of the *Fermentum,* a Host sent from the Bishop's Mass to parish churches when the priest of the district celebrated the Holy Eucharist. The origin of processions of the Blessed Sacrament is found in the ceremony of the *Sancta,* the particles of the Reserved Sacrament brought in procession to the altar and presently mingled with the newly consecrated Chalice. An interesting account of such a procession of the Host is extant in the description by a Bishop of Paris in the sixth century. "The Lord commanded Moses to make silver trumpets which the Levites were to sound whenever the sacrifice was offered so that all might bow and adore the Lord, while the column of fire or cloud approached which sanctified the sacrifice. And now the Church hymns the Body of Christ as it advances to the altar, yet no longer with trumpets, but with spiritual voices singing the glories of Christ in sweet measures." Another account of the same ceremony describes how, when the Reserved Sacrament is brought in, the celebrant adores It — *primo adorat Sancta.* It is but a short step from processions dictated by liturgical exigencies to processions designed to edify the faithful. The earliest evidence of such development comes to us from the Constitutions of Archbishop Lanfranc, (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1070—1089), who ordained that a procession of the Host should be held on Palm Sunday."

"Historically, then, the cultus of the Reserved Sacrament, though rooted in antiquity, emerged in approximately its present form in connection with that great revival of religion which reached its zenith in the thirteenth century. It has intimate connections also with the Catholic revivals of the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries. If history, therefore goes for anything, the present progress of this devotion is full of promise for the future of religion in this country. For upwards of eight hundred years the cultus of the Reserved Sacrament has held a place in the devotional life of Western Catholics—a place which three great revivals have confirmed in no uncertain manner. A devotion so spontaneous in its growth, so free in its exercise, so long continued, so steadily extending, is clearly a fact of Christian experience which demands the most reverent attention of all who honor the name of Christ. It is, indeed, inextricably connected with the whole

range of religious experience which corresponds with Catholic doctrines of the Eucharist."

Fr. Michell answers several objections to the use of the Reserved Sacrament. He asserts that it is not confined to any particular theory of the Real Presence. "There are various shades of doctrine which have sheltered under the word—Transubstantiation. There is the doctrine of a true objective presence which declines to investigate the mystery of *how* the Eucharistic gifts are Christ's Body and Blood, the doctrine, that is, of the Fathers of the Undivided Church which was so strongly represented in this country by the Tractarians. Recently an important contribution to Eucharistic theology has been made by Mr. Will Spens; Dr. Waterman's interesting essay will be familiar to many in this hall.* All these formulations of Catholic doctrine allow for the cultus of the Reversed Sacrament. Even a modernist such as M. Le Roy is far from denying the legitimacy of devotion before the Tabernacle.

---

*Rev. Lucius Waterman, D.D., being one of our own American theologians, it seems important to quote the passage referred to from the Paddock Lectures for 1918-1919, delivered at the General Theological Seminary, New York City. The title of the lectures is, The Eucharistic Body and Blood.

"I have been asked what bearing the thought which I have been presenting as that of the Fathers would have upon such practical questions of today as those which gather around the words 'Reservation' and 'Benediction'. I will be entirely frank, and say that so far as I can see, no Anglican theologian has anything to lose by accepting this view of the eucharistic Presence which I seem to find in the ancient writers. Here is our Lord vouchsafing a most special Presence of Himself among us, giving Himself to be our food and sustenance in the power of His life, giving Himself to receive our adoration in a visible embodiment, waiting, it may be, to receive our visits to His Tabernacle, or to give us His Blessing from the Monstrance..... What I have called the old theology finds our Lord in the sacrament as much as any modern theology. Nay, *more*, I think, for I myself can say, with Cyril of Alexandria, that according to this belief which I have learned from the Fathers, Christ appears visibly in His Body, and He permits and grants us to touch His holy flesh;' I have learned to say that I can *see* and *touch* the very Body of the Lord. What we ought to do with that wonderful gift is another matter. I will only say that I am convinced that devout men should have freedom to decide that question, each in his own way. If one man holds that visits to the Tabernacle and Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament are undesirable, let him not practice them. If another craves with his whole soul such approaches to our Lord, let no Bishop, no General Convention, no force of unreasoning prejudice, no! no wise and careful theologian even, take the responsibility of hindering that soul from coming to God in its own natural way, even as the flower turns toward the light. Our Lord is there. He is drawing men. Let them come to Him, as each one sees the way."

(The Eucharistic Body and Blood, pg. 212.)

"To suppose therefore that the cultus has any exclusive connection with the doctrine of Transubstantiation is clearly contrary to the fact. There is, indeed, an element of absurdity in finding a necessary connection between a practice which depends upon the presence of Christ, and a theory which asserts the absence of certain earthly substances. It has occasionally happened in the history of the Church that some who have believed in some sense the doctrine of the Real Presence have denied the permanence of that Presence in the Holy Gifts; St. Cyril of Alexandria knew of such people and condemned them. 'I hear,' he wrote, 'they say that the sacramental Consecration does not avail for hallowing if a portion of it be kept for another day. In saying so they are mad. For Christ is not altered, nor will His Holy Body be changed; but the power of the Consecration and the life-giving grace are permanent in it'."

The paper concludes with a statement, true to fact and experience, as to the bearing of the cultus of the Reserved Sacrament upon the devotional life. "At the moment it would seem that many who have lost a false support for faith have not yet learned the blessings of the true. It is therefore clearly the duty of the Church to do all in her power to emphasize communion with God, and impress its reality on all whom she can reach. In practice this is bound to mean frequent communion. Nothing can take the place of Sacramental Communion, and the desire for Sacramental Communion is notoriously strengthened by devotion before the Tabernacle.

The present facts of Christendom make patent the connection between frequent Communion and the cultus of the Holy Sacrament Reserved. In the East frequent Communion and the cultus are alike unknown; in the Roman obedience both frequent Communion and the cultus are more widely practised than in any other part of Christendom; in our own communion it is precisely among those who desire or enjoy free access to the Tabernacle that the practice of frequent Communion is making its greatest progress."

V. Life Beyond This World.

Continuing the consideration of Corporate Religion, the range of subjects passed to the Life beyond this world, consistently with the teaching of the Church that the Com-

munion of Saints is not confined to this world nor to human beings. Hence the subject of the Faithful Departed was given some special attention in view of the false philosophy underlying modern spiritualism. The paper by the Secretary of the English Church Union, the Rev. Arnold Pinchard, was a constructive setting forth of the Church's teaching as gathered from the Doctors of the Church, from St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas to the present time. The foundation, so widely lacking in discussions on these subjects, of an understanding of the constitution of human nature, is concisely expressed as follows. "The human being is compact of spirit and body. Spirit without body is not human being. Body without spirit is not human being. The fundamental and unchanging fact about a human being is that he is spirit and belongs to that family of spirits of which God is the Father. It is indeed the fact that the human spirit is the lowest and least of all the spirits that belongs to that divine family, but it is none the less as truly spirit as an angel, or God Himself. There is, of course, an enormous difference of intellectual greatness and power of will between one rank of spirits and another. But all spirits as such belong to one family, and to a greater or less extent enjoy and exercise all the powers which are proper to their constitution and mode of being. In the spirit world all knowledge is imparted from above, that is, ultimately from the mind of the Father of Spirits, who is God Himself. The spirit perceives truth by direct intuition, and needs no medium through which to impart it."

"It is necessary to bear in mind in any analysis of human nature the radical difference which is between spirit and matter. There is no natural affinity between the one and the other. 'Spirit', considered purely, must be regarded as being entirely remote from 'matter', and, normally speaking, incapable of entering into any sort of union with it. Yet nevertheless by the will of God and by the action of His irresistible power, in the case of human nature, spirit is intimately and closely allied with matter by its union with the body."

"In this strange and unique partnership there is a continuous action going on of the one upon the other. And chiefly it must be noted here that the work of the spirit which naturally strains upward toward God is to raise the sensitive life of the body so as to bring it, in the ways both of impulse

and restraint, to a higher degree of perfection than can be found elsewhere in any animal life in the world."

The development of thought is to show that in the struggle of the soul-spirit to uplift the sense-life of the body its reliance must be placed upon the assistance of the grace of God by the aid of which it is able to achieve that which is called "Spiritual Life." This may be defined as "life lived under conditions in which the spirit, straining upwards to God, is the dominant partner in union with the body, and in which the will is fixed more or less continuously upon righteousness, and is held more or less in steadfast accord with the will of God, with the result that the whole sense life is disciplined, refined, and exalted in harmony with and in submission to this ideal." This spiritual life developes, under the action of divine grace, "a desire of holiness, together with a corresponding aversion from and abhorrence of sin and evil. This is what is meant by the love of God."

Death is the passing "from the imperfection of this phase of life into the spirit world, and if the will towards God holds fast through that crisis, then as he enters into the new atmosphere and new conditions of free spirit-life, his will towards God becomes a permanent and unalterable thing. It can never more waver, change, or fail, any more than can that of the Holy Angels, and for similar reasons."

This carefully thought out and succinctly stated passage of the paper distinguishes the teaching of Catholic eschatology on death and the future life from the prevalent unsatisfying and abnormal, not to say grotesque, but popular attitude and teaching of Protestantism, and lays the foundation for the teaching of the Church and the witness of Holy Scripture on the State of the Departed, and the Beatific Vision. "At the death of the body, the spirit, having its choice fixed upon God as the result of successive acts of will made during this phase of life, passes into the pure spirit-state: the will is maintained fixed upon God through the moment of change, and the spirit by that act of will is irrevocably given to God. At the same moment in which the spirit enters upon its freedom, it is brought face to face with God in the Particular Judgement. The spirit stands naked, as it were, before the Judge, and sees the beauty of holiness in the face of Jesus Christ; and by and through that vision, and because of the

sudden access of knowledge and wisdom with which its intellect is flooded, realizes the beauty of holiness as never before, and sees and realizes also the heinous character and black ingratitude of sin seen, not from the human standpoint, but for the first time from the standpoint of the Divine. And because of the effect of the vision of the holiness of God and of the horror and of wickedness of sin then received, the loving and penitent spirit becomes capable of and does then and there make an act of pure contrition, whereby it becomes perfectly pleasing to God, established in grace, and intrinsically fit for and capable of the enjoyment of the Beatific Vision."

This statement of the witness of Holy Scripture and the teaching of Catholic theology is the basis for understanding the state of purification of departed faithful souls, the value and efficacy of the prayers and Eucharists of the Church on earth, and the relation between the Church Militant and the Church Expectant. The theory that for the Faithful Departed the Intermediate State is a state of painful though salutary cleansing makes it "easy to perceive how our prayers and alms, our suffrages and devotions, and the offering of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ itself, can be accepted by God on behalf of spirits in durance, for the amelioration of their condition, for the assuaging of their pains, and even for the curtailment of the period of their imprisonment in that place of suffering. For in respect of these things we and they alike hang absolutely upon the mercy of God, and are utterly and wholly at His disposal."

The consideration of the division of the spirit-world, according to the "certain knowledge given us by revelation from God in the Holy Scriptures," leads up to a pointed warning concerning phenomena connected with spiritualism. The three sections of the spirit-world are: (1) God, the Master Mind and the Sovereign Will of the universe; below Him is the Hierarchy of Light, consisting of the Angels in their seven orders, but also a hierarchy of darkness, including the angels fallen from their original estate, headed and governed by Lucifer, or Satan, "who exercise their activities in opposition to the will of God. These latter are specifically recognized in Holy Scripture as the inveterate enemies of the human race." (2) The second section includes "those human spirits which have passed out of this phase of life-experience

and are to be found among those whom we specifically designate 'The Saints,' in the enjoyment of the Beatific Vision, while with these may be classed also other spirits more recently departed from the body who are, as St. Peter says, 'in prison,' who are 'in the hand of God,' and by an act of God and with their own consent are for a time debarred from access to the Beatific Vision." (3) "As it is impossible to ignore the fact that the Holy Scriptures contemplate the practical possibility of the final condemnation of some human spirits," the third section includes "those spirits which have departed this life in a state of direct antagonism to goodness and of alienation from God. These are wandering spirits that have no home. If they find alliance anywhere in the spirit-world, it seems probable that they must find it with the fallen angels, and are associated with them in a fratricidal antagonism toward the whole human race."

In connection with this classification the writer sounds an emphatic note of warning to those who are being attracted by the false and delusive claims of spiritualism. "It is impossible to suppose that the spirits of just men made perfect, who are either in bliss of the Beatific Vision or restrained under the hand of God in the prison of their glorious suffering, can be at the call and beck of a sentimental and often unholy curiosity, through means of communication that are as ludicrously undignified in character as they are unsatisfactory in results. It is equally impossible to believe that these exalted beings can possibly be the source whence come the drivelling and meaningless messages to which the devoted votaries of this cult attach so fond and extravagant importance. If, as seems probable on the evidence, there is some real communication carried on by these means with the spirit-world, it is entirely possible that those who respond from the other side are either wandering spirits of the lost, earthbound perhaps, but certainly antagonistic alike to God and man: or still more probably members of the hierarchy of darkness, devils who take advantage of the folly and credulity of man, in order to lure him away from God and the truth as it is in Jesus, and to gain ascendancy over the spirit of the individual with malign intent and disastrous results."

From the all too brief paper on The Saints and Angels by Dr. Darwell Stone we may transcribe but one passage, of

exquisite beauty and persuasiveness, as he describes the family in heaven and earth of which God is the Father—"the Father of the angels, of the saints, of the faithful dead, of Christians still living upon earth. All these have a relation to Him with which may be compared the relation of sons and daughters to father and mother in an earthly home. All these have a relation to one another with which may be compared the relation of brothers and sisters in a human family."

"There is the glory of the saints. In that common glory there are special crowns—the crown of the apostle, the crown of the confessor, of the bishop, of the doctor, of the martyr, of the holy matron, of the virgin. And above all the rest, so glorious that by comparision she has been termed 'our tainted nature's solitary boast,' there is the Mother of our Lord and God. For she possesses a privilege which is all her own. She can never cease to be that which she once became, the Mother of God. To every child of man throughout the world there is one mother who has a unique relation to her babe; and our Lady is the one Mother of the one Being in all the universe who is born of woman and is also eternal God. Therefore of created beings she is the most glorious. Later in time, less in nature, than the Seraphim and the Cherubim, she has been exalted above them by the special relation to God the Son which is the lot of the Mother alone."

"What then are the spiritual actions which are called for in us by the angels and saints and the Mother of our Lord? There is, first, thankfulness. In our dull lives we need the brightness that comes from angel and saint. In trial and temptation we need the encouragement which their victories give. In the difficulties which keep our ideals high we need the stimulus of knowing their great love. For all the help thus ours by the remembrance of them we thank God. We mark the honour which we pay them by the dedication of our churches, by the use of banners and pictures and images, by our reverence to all representations of them. Thankfulness and veneration are our acts in response to what angels and saints are in themselves, and to what they have done and now do for us. Further, we seek the help of the power which the influence of their lives makes to pervade the body of Christ, and we ask for their prayers. And we are mindful of the great community of prayer among those who are in Christ.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC

I quote the words of a Russian theologian: 'If anyone believes, he is in the communion of faith: if he loves, he is in the communion of love; if he prays, he is in the communion of prayer. Wherefore no one can rest his hope on his own prayers, and everyone who prays asks the whole Church for intercession, not as if he had doubts of the intercession of Christ, the one Advocate, but in the assurance that the whole Church ever prays for all her members. All the angels pray for us, the apostles, martyrs, and patriarchs, and above them all, the Mother of our Lord and this holy unity is the true life of the Church.' "

VI. Personal Religion.

The Anglo-Catholic Congress put itself on record as laying the greatest stress upon the spiritual life by making the subject of personal Religion the climax of the regular sessions in the Albert Hall. Nothing could have been more significant than to attend first to the foundations—the Divine Christ and His Kingdom, the Church, His authority, His teaching, His sacraments—upon which is to be built the spiritual fabric, and then to come to the matter which is the outgrowth of all these, the life in Christ, "the simplicities of practical piety." The devout priest who lead the way in this subject had the assent of all the members of the Congress when he declared, "we know that the highest service we can render to the heart of Jesus Christ is the exhibition of a life surrendered to Him, and growing in conformity to His mind and will."

A few extracts from these addresses on the devotional and spiritual life will indicate the high ideal of the Christian life for which English Catholics stand.

Prayer and Communion "are indeed distinct; but though distinct there is a real connection between them. Each is a means of establishing a vital relationship between the soul and God. Prayer lays stress upon the side of human aspiration and effort; Communion on the side of the grace and gift of God. But in each case the intercourse is mutual; sacramental grace can work no spiritual result unless there be the personal response of the soul; nor could prayer retain its reality unless it came into operative contact with the heart and the will of God."

"Prayer is a natural instinct but the Incarnation has raised it to an altogether different level. In the long drama of human history we see man continually seeking after God if haply he may find Him; and God gradually drawing nearer to His people, till at length the movement culminates in the Incarnation, in which God and man are united in the Person of the Incarnate Son. So has Christ opened for every man a road to the Father's heart. So by the indwelling Spirit of Christ can each one of us possess that freedom of access by which, as by a Jacob's ladder, the spiritual commerce between heaven and earth is maintained. Prayer is no longer a natural impulse, but a supernatural activity.

"To those, then, who are in Christ Jesus, prayer has become a new experience. But if the Incarnation has thus enriched and transformed the approach of the soul to God, even more gloriously has it opened the road by which God draws near to man, through the Sacraments of His grace. In particular we think of the Holy Communion. The Blessed Sacrament is the greatest instrument which the Holy Spirit uses for our sanctification. There are three moments in the activities of our Incarnate Lord which may express to us the secret of His redemptive work: Bethlehem; Calvary, with its fulfillment at the Ascension; and Pentecost. At Bethlehem is revealed to us the presence of God under the form of humanity. 'The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us.' On Calvary is offered the 'full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world,' to be presented forever by His glorious Person in the heavenly places. And at Pentecost the life manifested in the crib, and offered on the Cross, is bestowed upon us by the Spirit sent from heaven. 'When He ascended up on high, He gave gifts unto men.' Here are the central truths of our Redemption, and here are the essential facts of the Blessed Sacrament. The presence of our Lord, God and Man, under the forms of bread and wine; the Sacrifice ever presented in the heavenly courts, and pleaded continually upon the altars of the Church: the gift of His own life-giving Body and Blood, ministered through the power of the Spirit to the faithful—Bethlehem, Calvary, Pentecost,—are renewed in the consummation of that great action of grace."

The writer goes on to speak of a right disposition as a

requirement of communicants. The preparation is two-fold—the preparation of discipline and the preparation of devotion. The former refers to certain outward dispositions required by the Church, the latter to "certain inward dispositions demanded by love." Among the disciplinary requirements it is pointed out that "those who approach the altar (1) must be baptized and confirmed; or, if not confirmed, must be ready and desirous so to be; (2) must heartily and sincerely accept the faith of the Church, as formulated in her primitive Creeds; and (3) must observe the ancient and universal law of the fast before Communion." Under the preparation of devotion, repentance is first named. Besides repentance, in preparation for Communion, we need spiritual desire. While in addition to repentance and desire there must be resolve, that is, our special intention at each Communion. The normal procedure is completed by making after each Communion a careful thanksgiving, and the effort to develop the special grace which has been desired.

An optimistic note, with which we may well conclude our survey, is struck by pointing out that the great evidential witness to the Church as a mightily working power is from the side of spiritual growth and holiness. "The Catholic cause in the Church of England has its own serious conflicts and uncertainties, while there are not wanting candid critics who tell us that the force of the Catholic revival is spent. But of one thing we in this Congress are persuaded. The progress of Catholic principles in the last hundred years has been due, under God's grace, to many causes, but to none more than to the fact that men have seen in the movement the expression of personal religion and devotion to our Lord. In the same strength its further victories will be won. And there is no single one of us who cannot make his contribution to that cause; and in his own life of earnest prayer and devout communion exalt the honour of our Lord and advance the triumph of His Church."

3.

Anglo-Catholicism To-Day

IN speaking to you this evening upon the topic of "Anglo-Catholicism To-day," I am keenly conscious that there are two aspects in which the subject may be viewed. First, there is the narrow aspect which takes into consideration only that group of Anglicans who apprehend the greatness and glory of their Catholic heritage. Then there is the other and broader view which sweeps within its range the whole visible body of the Anglican Communion.

Now, while the treatment of the first aspect of the subject would be interesting, and afford some degree of satisfaction and encouragement, were we to confine ourselves to it, we should be working to disadvantage, because there would be wanting a proper background against which to show the progress of Catholicizing which is all the while going on. In the opinion of the writer, therefore, it seems wiser, more judicial, and vastly more interesting to face the problem as it exists; to try to see the situation in its proper perspective, rather than hide our heads in the sand and beguile ourselves into believing that only those who think as we think are Anglo-Catholic. I remember well a conversation held some years ago with the late Bishop Grafton, in which I expressed doubt as to the validity of the official acts of a certain clergyman who held extremely loose sacramental views. His reply was so strong and comforting. He said, "It makes no difference what view of the Sacraments any individual may hold, provided his own baptism, confirmation and ordination are regular. His personal denials do not release him from his official prerogative. He is a Catholic Priest, whether he believes it or not, and the recitation of the prescribed words of the Prayer Book over the prescribed Elements makes a valid Catholic Sacrament, whether the Officiant acknowledges the fact or denies it." And by this same process of sound and logical reasoning it is quite unnecessary, in this presence, to add that every baptized member of the Anglo-Catholic Church is an Anglo-Catholic whether he be bad or good, un-

believing or believing, unconscious or conscious of his privilege.

Now with this much by way of general outline, let us turn to consider briefly something of the magnitude of the City of God. Let us try to "see the land, what it is, and the people that dwelleth therein, whether they be strong or weak, few or many, and what cities they dwell in, whether in tents or in strongholds."

And the first to claim our attention is the Church of the British Empire, with its 18 Provinces, 20 independent Sees, 15 Missionary Jurisdictions, making in rough figuring a total of 184 Dioceses; with 18 Archbishops and Metropolitans, 212 other active Bishops, and 63 retired, in all 293; and that impressive army of approximately 30,000 Priests, and millions of baptized members.

Then we must add to this array our own American Church, with its 8 Provinces, 12 extra-provincial jurisdictions in foreign lands; with 126 active Bishops, and 10 retired, making 136 Bishops; nearly 6000 Clergy, and upwards of two million baptized members. I wish it were possible to denominate also our Archbishops and Metropolitans, but unfortunately our democratic terminologies are chosen to conform more with those employed by Banking House and Commercial Institution, than with a Catholic Church, so we must content ourselves with such titles as "Presidents," "Secretaries," and "Presiding Bishop and Council."

But to proceed, according to such hurried and imperfect computations as the writer is able to make, Anglo-Catholicism to-day comprises 26 Provinces, with 286 Dioceses and Jurisdictions; 18 Archbishops, 384 other active Bishops, 73 retired, in all 439 Bishops; and fully 36,000 Priests. To attempt any enumeration of the stately Cathedrals, the parish Churches great and small, Chapels, Mission Stations, Schools, Colleges, Hospitals, Reformatories, Monastic Institutions, and other physical properties, would be obviously beyond our capacity, but, could it be done, would be amazingly beyond belief. Friends, we Anglo-Catholics of to-day are citizens of no mean city. "The hill of Sion is a fair place."

Now it would be a wonderful thing could we add those other familiar and thrilling words of the Psalmist, "Jerusalem is built as a city; that is at unity in itself." But since we cannot, nothing will be gained by side-stepping the issues with

which the Church is confronted, nor minimizing the real difficulties which block the wheels of progress toward the consummation of a more ideal Catholicism. In discussing this phase of our subject I must, of course, confine my observations to the familiar field of our own American Church, though I fear what we deem peculiar to us is common to the whole Communion, differing perhaps only in degree. And while there may be much in this analysis to sadden us, there will be also much to cheer. We say to the child,—take the bitters, it will make you better, then you shall have a piece of candy. If we begin that way, if we consider the bitterness of our faults first, it will tend to make us better and enable us to appreciate the sweet and encouraging things which follow.

The discouraging factors in our organic life are so numerous and complex that we can only touch upon two or three of the more prominent ones. It makes little difference in what order we take them. Suppose, therefore, we consider first the Protestantizing element in the midst of our Catholicism. It is difficult to account for such a paradox, but the truth remains that a large number, I fear a majority, of our Bishops, Clergy, and lay-folk, esteem the Church to be a peculiar sort of pink-tipped, halo-trimmed, glorified protestant denomination, very much superior indeed to ordinary vulgar protestantism, but just inferior enough to escape the odious charge of Catholicism. And I believe you will sympathize when I state that I find myself wholly incapable of solving the mystery of those processes of reasoning which are responsible for such erroneous conclusions. The fact exists however, and presents a very real obstacle to Catholic progress, because many, perhaps most Christians outside the Church, Romans and Protestant alike, have come to measure us at the estimate which the Protestantizing element has put upon the Catholic Church. Psychologists tell us that man is prone to live up or down to the reputation which he enjoys or suffers from, and this most unenviable reputation for which the Protestant element is responsible has had its reflex influence upon a vast multitude of our improperly equipped Church people. Communicants everywhere, in their social and business relations with other Christians, are being constantly told that the Protestant Episcopal Church is Protestant. They try at first feebly to defend themselves, but, having been provided with

no adequate weapons of defense, lose courage and finally lie down under the damning accusation, and end in believing that because everybody thinks they are Protestants they must be so. It is sad and discouraging to contemplate such a condition, chiefly because it seems so utterly unnecessary when there stands before us that great open storehouse of history, tradition, and practice which testifies to the Catholic character of the Anglican Church beyond all peradventure of doubt. It is unbelievable that so many superior intellects should see only the uncongenial mud of Protestantism about their feet, and fail to catch the glorious vision of a Catholicism purged from all the undesirable features of Latinism. We become impatient sometimes at the obtuse reasoning and obstinacy of those who "like the deaf adder, refuse to hear the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely."

Much more could be said along this line. For example, it would be interesting to trace the weakness to its source, to seek to place the responsibility for its existence, but time forbids, and we must hasten on to speak next of the evil which the Church suffers at the hands of the destructive Theologians. "They go to and fro in the evening; grin like a dog, and run about through the city. Behold they speak with their mouth and swords are their lips; for who doeth hear." The Psalmist here puts the whole matter into a nutshell. These tiger-people in the Church, who too often sit in high places, attack with apparent indifference, under the mask of superior scholarship and through the instrumentality of faulty logic and false philosophy, the eternal verities of the Christian Religion. In subtly veiled language they declare the philosophical impossibility of the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation and the resurrection of the body; they assume in bold and lofty terms the doubtful authenticity of this or that book of the Bible; they try to rationalize the miraculous and scoff openly at the whole realm of the supernatural. The damage which the Holy Church suffers from this class is great, but fortunately they are confined to a comparatively narrow sphere of influence. Perhaps they suffer most themselves from their own poison, since, praise God, the rank and file of Churchmen know nothing of them, and many of those who do are saved from their wiles by a wholesome sense of American humor and good nature. Their gross denials and coarse

blasphemies however, are growing fainter day by day and we have good hope that the fast-waning influence of their heresies may soon die in its own welter.

Of the many discouraging obstacles which tend to retard the advance of Anglo-Catholicism there is one other which must not be ignored. I refer to those oft repeated exhibitions of wierd and illogical individualism which continually beset us. And in speaking of this difficulty fairness compels me to say that it is not confined to any particular school of thought. It is a strange sporadic ailment, as likely to break out in one place as another, but one to which many of our Clergy show a marked susceptibility. Nor am I at all certain that any one of us is wholly immune, for the ancient proverb of the old Scotch woman holds, "that everybody is queer but thee and me, and sometimes I think thee is a little queer."

In its mild form individualism manifests itself most frequently in the conduct of the public services, when some of our Clergy seem possessed to say and do usual things in some unusual and extraordinary way. Two reported incidents, both taken from our New England Church life, will serve to illustrate the point.

The one is the case of a Priest who, throughout his ministry, has habitually emptied the residue of the Consecrated Element from the Chalice out of the Church window, and disposed of the other elements by burning, thus violating a clear and concise rubric. The other is the case of a Priest maintaining a perpetual light, genuflecting, and even prostrating, before the Altar in a Church where the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament has never even been contemplated. So while it may be low, or it may be high, this mild form of individualism is always sad because it is always funny, and since it confuses the minds of the faithful is always pernicious and detrimental.

Were this the only form, however, in which individualism manifested itself it would at least be local, and consequently attract no marked attention, but when an egotist becomes ego-centric and his individualism begins to reflect his pessimism we must stand ready to hoist our storm-warnings and begin to look for the approach of some miserable public scandal which is sure to bring the Catholic Church into open contumely and make her the sport and gazing-stock of the

world, through the instrumentality of the venal public press. The two outbursts which have recently occurred in the Diocese and City of New York from one class of enemies, and the cowardly betrayal of the Church in Delaware and other similar apostacies from another class, will serve to illustrate my meaning and warn us of the baleful effects arising from unbridled individualism in its more violent form. "From all blindness of heart; from pride, vain-glory, and hypocrisy; from envy, hatred, and malice, and all uncharitableness, Good Lord deliver us."

We turn now to consider what remedial measures may be employed to improve these distressing conditions which we have just been reviewing. And of course the initial step is to watch and pray. And to impress the point which I wish to make, I am sure you will absolve me from irreverence if I quote the legend of the Irish soldier who, when his Chaplain admonished him just before going over the top, "to watch and pray," replied, "Your Reverence I'll try to remember me prayers, but when I go over the top nobody has to tell me to watch." Now, mingled with our constant prayers and supplications for the better establishment and defence of our spiritual Zion, we must not forget to watch. The members of the Churchmen's Alliance must man the towers and scrutinize every movement going on in the Anglo-Catholic Church today. May I point out one or two of the important matters which should be looked after?

First we should look to, and seek to influence those sources from which our Clergy are produced, I mean the Theological Seminaries where our young men are being trained. "As the twig is bent, the tree inclines" is an axiom which in this respect may not safely be disregarded. Those unprejudiced minds, brought up from the Schools and Universities to the final stage of their training, afford exceptionally plastic ground upon which the right or wrong sort of impression can be easily made. The Church is suffering to-day for want of the right sort of spiritual teaching in our parishes, because many of our spiritual teachers are so absorbed in social service, so-called, that the flock must starve on the husks of high sounding phrases instead of the solid truths of the Christian religion. Here, and in the proper education of the children in our Church schools, is presented an unlimited op-

portunity for the Alliance, by praying, watching and doing, to exercise a strong and helpful influence.

The next remedial measure, which can be helpfully employed, is the continuance and intensification of that work which has been so admirably begun by the Alliance. I mean the work of organization. The writer is among those who believe that the chief hope of Anglo-Catholicism to-day rests with the laity. When convinced and converted they can act with greater freedom and exercise wider influence than the Clergy. Once establish a small nucleus of right minded praying people in a parish or community and we have accomplished a more effective and lasting result for Anglo-Catholicism than all the legislation in the world. Our work of organization therefore, should be extended and perfected as far and as speedily as possible. Then, as occasion requires, the cross of fire may pass from city to city, from town to town, from hamlet to hamlet, summoning to action, in prayer and propaganda, the whole Clan of Loyal Churchmen, that their voices may be heard and their influence recognized in the work of purging, strengthening, and upbuilding of our Holy Mother, the Church.

The third and last remedy suggested is one which, at first thought, may not meet with your unanimous approval, but in the main I feel sure you will agree, and that is the remedy of mingling freely with all classes of Churchmen. Nothing can be gained by standing aloof and emphasizing our partisanship, while much good can be accomplished by cordial contact, by kindly and discreet words, by speaking the language of the Church, and generally breaking down the partitions of misunderstanding. The late Dean Hodges, in one of his able sermons entitled "Saints in Society," makes the point that for Christians to segregate themselves from contact with society in general is like putting all the yeast in one vessel and all the dough in another and expecting to make bread. The truth of this trite statement is self-evident, and applies admirably to the case in hand. If Catholic minded people, Clergymen and Laymen alike, are going to hold aloof from their less fortunate brethren they thereby forfeit their opportunity of influencing those whose view-point is faulty, and whose need for enlightenment and development is great. A number of years ago a certain select club of Priests, with

which I am acquainted, whose tendencies were all one way, and that not our way, elected to its membership an outstanding Catholic leader. Since then two or three other Catholic minded men have been admitted, and all with the happiest outcome. Prejudice has been overcome, sympathetic relations have been established with the most satisfactory results, and all in favor of better things. In this connection may I also point out, in dealing with those of our brethren who are not in agreement with full Catholic teaching and practice, how important it is to be sweet-tempered and encouraging, rather than impatient and supercilious. One lost opportunity comes to my mind, namely the ungentle and unsympathetic attitude of a very able Catholic Priest toward a young Bishop who was pointed in the right direction, and whose willingness to conform was greater than his ability to perform certain obscure and, for the Bishop, unusual offices. The unhappy occurrence so deeply hurt and humiliated the Bishop that he was embittered not only against the Priest in question, but all Catholic minded people in general. In brief, he was set back years in his growth toward the Catholic cause.

Finally, any review of Anglo-Catholicism to-day which should fail to take into reckoning the encouraging signs which are everywhere about us, would be too hopelessly pessimistic to be worthy of serious consideration. Too much optimism, we are told, is as dangerous as too great pessimism, but for myself I should far rather err on the side of hopefulness, for so long as we are acutely conscious of true conditions cheerfulness cannot be as harmful as despondency.

Let us seek now to measure the value of some of the advances which have been made in the past twenty-five years.

a. The custom of early Sunday Eucharist, a quarter of a century ago, was regarded as peculiar. To-day we may truthfully say it is universal.

b. The restoration of the Eucharist to its rightful place as the chief act of Christian worship at the popular or mid-day Sunday service has made a tremendous advance. First once a month, then once a fortnight in a vast majority of our churches, and now weekly, in a rapidly increasing number of parishes, and we may confidently look forward to a complete fulfillment of the Catholic ideal in this respect within the next decade.

c. The increasing number of parishes where the daily Sacrifice is offered. Twenty-five years ago one could call off at random the dozen or so parishes which were notorious in this respect. To-day it is no longer notorious. Even our S. Paul's Cathedral, Boston, established the daily Eucharist two or three years ago. And in the next quarter of a century the parish which does not provide the daily Eucharist will be the one to be accounted peculiar.

d. Then there are the countless small matters, like proper Sacramental Bread, once unusual, now universal; the use of Altar lights in the great majority of our Cathedrals and parish churches; a much more general use of proper Eucharistic vestments.

All these things, small and unimportant if you so deem them, are at least contributary signs pointing to the advancement of the Catholic cause. To these encouraging advances may be added the open Churches, the increasing number of parishes where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, and the constantly growing number of penitents.

Again, there is a deepening sense of piety manifesting itself everywhere in the Church. The Church's view-point of twenty-five years ago is no longer adapted to meet the social conditions of to-day. Bishops, Clergy and Laity recognize this and are awakening to the need of ministering in a more effective way to a people, whose allegiance to the Church is strained to the breaking-point by the exacting claims of our dizzy daily life.

But the most encouraging factor of all is that the Anglo-Catholic Church is attracting the wide spread attention of all sorts of earnest Christians to itself as the promised vantage-ground and trysting-place where the divided forces of the Suffering Christ may meet and blend.

In concluding this address, may I say that I have purposely ignored the whole Concordat Question. First, because all that can be said on the subject has already been said so well that I feel myself unable to make any real contribution. And further, because, while fully believing that in its present form it will fail and fall of its own weight, I hesitate to condemn any attempt which contemplates a possible assumption of Protestantism into the glorious freedom of the Catholic Church.

Finally, dear friends of the Churchman's Alliance, your lecturer believes, as he trusts you also believe, that Anglo-Catholicism to-day is a living, advancing, conquering *cause,* with much terrain yet to be possessed and many dangerous trenches yet to be reduced and captured. And those who hold firmly to the unchanging truth that the Anglo-Catholic Church is a Divine Organism and not a human organization will be given faith, hope and strength from the unchanging God of justice to hold on until the banner of our Catholicism shall be planted firmly and gloriously upon the hill-top of accomplishment. And our hill of Sion shall be not only a fair place, but the joy of the whole earth.

Several years ago an Oxford Don, walking out toward the hillside Cross, on a Good Friday, where the Three Hours Service was to be held, was asked by the Religious who was to deliver the meditations, this question, "And what shall I say for you to-day?" The Don replied very simply and seriously, "Tell me the old, old story." And why not end with the old, old words, so old yet ever new.

"Though with a scornful wonder
Men see her sore opprest,
By schisms rent asunder,
By heresies distrest;
Yet saints their watch are keeping,
Their cry goes up 'how long?'
And soon the night of weeping
Shall be the morn of song."

4.

Characteristics of Modern Protestantism

I. The Definition of the word "Protestant": non-Roman? or non-Catholic?

I am asked to speak of some Characteristics of Modern Protestantism. There are embarrassments in dealing with the subject, for Protestantism is a phenomenon difficult to define and almost impossible to describe. Perhaps no two persons would give exactly the same definition of Protestantism, but definitions really reduce to two classes, according as "Protestant" is taken to be the opposite of "Romanist", or the opposite of "Catholic". The former view is, of course, the view taken by those who in the eighteenth century fastened the title "Protestant Episcopal" upon us as the legal name of our American Catholic Church. In that view an enumeration of the world's Protestant forces would have to include the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchates, the great Church of Russia in its agony of persecution, the Western "Old Catholics", and all the branches of the Anglican Communion. But perhaps it may be said that Protestants have the best right to be heard as to the definition of their own title, and certainly, to the generality of Protestants, "Protestant" and "Catholic" stand opposed. Most Protestants do not call themselves "Catholics". Most Catholics do not like to call themselves "Protestants". I accept in this lecture the popular definition. I use "Protestant" as meaning "non-Catholic". I use the word "Protestantism" to stand for a great religious force which is at work in the world to-day, which is opposed to Catholicism, which is known to itself and to its critics as "Protestantism", which certainly needs a distinctive name, and for which there is no other convenient and recognized name. It will be understood, then, that when I speak, to-night, of the Protestant religion, I am speaking of a religion which deserves from us much respect and sympathy for many noble lives, many great thinkers, and many beneficent good works, but which is not ours.

II. Protestantism, a Movement.

I have said that Protestantism, difficult to define, is almost impossible to describe. Protestantism might seem to be of the same celestial family with the God Proteus, of the Greek mythology, who could change himself into any form he liked. For Protestantism is not merely a great fact, but a great movement, and movements are elusive things. You note what is entirely and characteristically true of the movement in one place, and someone cries to you that what you have been saying is not true at all—at some entirely different point in the movement. For movements *move,* and pass through many changes, and it may be added, movements move to an inevitable end. The Mississippi River runs from northern Minnessota to the Gulf of Mexico. At this very moment some of the water is in Minnesota, and some is flowing between Missouri and Illinois, and some is stagnating perhaps in some pool where it was left from an overflow, and some is passing New Orleans. But one thing is sure; most of that water will reach the Gulf at last. The Protestant movement in modern history is such a stream. The movement is not a simultaneous movement. It goes on much more rapidly in some Churches than in other Churches. It has gone, for instance, much farther in the United States than in England or in Scotland. Things which are said quite truly of American Congregationalists and Presbyterians, and things to which many Congregationalists and Presbyterians point with pride, are regarded as a shocking scandal in England, and vehemently and incautiously denied, though even in England Protestant Churches have entered upon what that great Protestant, Charles Spurgeon, used to call "The Downgrade Movement". No! This great movement is not simultaneous, and it is not homogeneous. Few things that one can say of Protestants are true of all Protestants, and nothing that one can say of Protestants is true of all Protestants alike. When I say that Protestantism leads to this or that, I shall be liable to be sharply criticized by many Protestants, if they ever read what I have written, these good men saying, "We are totally misrepresented. Protestantism has never led us to such results at all." Such are the difficulties that meet one who attempts to criticize a great, myriad-minded move-

ment of thought. I can only say that I have labored and prayed to present here nothing but facts fairly stated, and nothing but facts that are (1) fairly representative of the direction in which Protestantism is moving, and (2) indicative of the end toward which it goes.

III. The Fundamental Difference between Protestantism and Catholicism.

There is one great common bond between Protestantism and Catholicism. It would be a sin against truth not to state it. It would be a sin against love, which is a greater matter than even truth, to underrate it. The saints of both systems—and both systems *have* saints—have a burning zeal for the service of God and a burning zeal for the service of men. Both systems are meant to promote these ends. Each system is to its followers the best way that they have been able to see to find God, and help the world. That finding God and helping the world are the two best ends in life, both parties are agreed. They differ as to what God offers us as ways and means of reaching the great end. In trying to set forth some present characteristics of the Protestant Movement, I must speak somewhat of its history, but first of all I must state what seems to me to be the fundamental and essential difference between modern Protestantism and that Catholicism which is of all time. To put it all in a single phrase, Protestantism is a religion of inspiration; Catholicism is a religion of revelation. Perhaps I may express it better by saying that Protestantism is a religion of a single revelation. Protestantism says that a man must find his way to God by following his own best thoughts. They are what God has given him, and God has not given him, and could not give him, anything else. A hundred years ago almost all Protestants would have said that the Bible was a book of infallible religious teaching and included much of revelation. The movement has moved on far since those days, and the majority of Protestant thinkers now take the line that no inspiration could ever make a man, even the writers of Holy Scripture, to be an infallible teacher, and that God cannot, under the laws of the universe as He has made them, make any revelation of His truth to the creature, man. Catholicism says, on the other hand, that we really have a revelation.

God has made known a portion of his own thought as an illuminating message and a healing medicine. He has made this message known so that men can really know. A man must submit himself, says Catholicism, to this divine message, with its accompaniment of a few special directions, and of a few particular supernatural gifts, called Sacraments, and if the man finds that anything which has seemed to him before to be a part of his own best thoughts appears now to be in conflict with this gift of the thoughts of God, the man must, of course, thankfully submit his mind to be corrected by God's revelation of the truth.

I think that few Protestants will quarrel with my statement that their system teaches a man to follow his own best thoughts, and teaches him further that he has nothing else to follow. If they mention the Bible, it will be only in the sense of the good Baptist lady who said to me, more than forty years ago, "I believe that everything in the Bible is inspired which is inspired to *me!*" But our Protestant friends so little understand our claim to the possession of infallible guidance, that I must take time to express our difference in another way. This time, I will put the Catholic claim first.

The Catholic Church *remembers* — that is our great word—that our Blessed Lord, in the forty days between His Resurrection and His Ascension, gave to His Apostles certain instructions and directions, "speaking the things concerning the Kingdom of God." What those things were, the Church was not told in any book of the New Testament. Of course, not. The Church remembered what those things really were, and needed no reminder. In fact, the Catholic Church remembers, and has never ceased to testify, that in that teaching-time our Lord delivered a faith unto the saints,—what S. Paul speaks of as "the Gospel",—and delivered it once for all. The Catholic Church remembers what that delivered faith included, and the Church knows that what was included in that faith was true. It is not a part of the old, original Catholic claim that the Church can make any fresh revelation of her own at any time, add any new articles to this "faith," re-write this "Gospel." S. Paul anathematizes any such attempt, and the great Council of Chalcedon echoes him. We claim only that the Holy Spirit, guiding God's people into all the truth, enabled the Church, in the controversies of the

fourth and fifth centuries, to see truly and decide justly as to whether certain new religious teachings were, or were not, antagonistic to the ancient faith. The Church pronounced that these opinions *were* inconsistent with the remembered faith. It was not a judgment as to whether new views of certain great subjects were true or false as a matter of philosophic theology, but whether they were consistent with a remembered revelation. What our Lord gave to His Church to keep safe, He enabled His Church to keep safe. That is the claim of the Catholic Church, and of every faithful Catholic.

Yet here honesty as to Catholic faults and fairness as to Protestant faults require of me an important admission. The modern Protestant position looks to us Catholics like a wilful refusal of light. But we need to remember that the mistakes of noble men have always a noble origin. We need to face the fact that the Protestant fault in the Reformation-movement arose out of a Catholic fault. The Mediaeval Church had greatly abused the principle of authority in Religion. It had not been content to remember the infallible teachings of our Lord, and demand men's allegiance to the once-for-all delivered faith. The Mediaeval Church had yielded to the temptation to regard its own judgments as infallible, and demand submission to everything in the way of either theology or Church order which the ruling authorities of the Church might agree to impose. The Mediaeval Church departed from the lines of a true Catholicism by adding "necessary things" of its own devising—such necessary things, for example, as the Theory of Transubstantiation, of the Papal Supremacy,—to the "necessary things" of our Lord Himself. By setting up in this way a false "authority" it poisoned the minds of men with a morbid suspicion and dislike of the whole idea of Church authority. Because the Mediaeval Church did use its authority to impose upon men things which clearly our Lord did not impose, therefore it came to be a fundamental position of the Protestant mind that to receive anything on the authority of the Church is to set up another authority in place of the authority of Jesus Christ. The Church as we know it has repented of that sin, and stands now on a truly Catholic foundation. But the revolt of Protestantism was in its beginning a revolt against something un-Catholic. The complaint of Protestantism said, "The Church has tried to

compel us by its authority to believe things which come not with God's authority, and are not true. We will never submit our minds to the authority of the Church again." The Protestant complaint was just. The bitter sense of having been imposed upon and tyrannized over by the Church, which Protestantism has brought down the centuries from the Reformation-period as one of its most treasured traditions, is in a measure just. We ought to acknowledge that much. We may still insist that in casting off the false "authority" they should not have cast away the true. They did cast away the true "authority" with the false, and then, suffering the Nemesis of their unhappy mistake, they set up that same evil of a false "authority," the making by groups of men of "creeds" that were only *their own* "creeds," all over again. They set up precisely that antithesis from which they had tried so desperately to break away, the imposing of the opinions of men instead of the facts of God.

Protestants generally think of us as making claim, which the Roman Church does make, that the Catholic Church has an office as a revealer of truth, and not merely as a faithful rememberer of a revelation once made. But even when we have made clear our more modest position, Protestantism will have none of it. Protestantism will not allow that the Church has any continuous, unchanging memory, what I may call a "corporate memory," of its own past, even of such a fact as our Lord's rising from the dead. Protestantism holds that the only means we have of finding any facts of early Christian history is to study the New Testament writings, with their manifold allusions to things which were then matters of common knowledge, and try to piece these allusions together, and so find out what it was that the Church then knew so familiarly. And Protestantism in these days generally adds that the writers of the New Testament books may in some cases need to be sharply corrected by modern scholars, as having gravely mis-understood the religious teachings of Jesus of Nazareth.

Once again, then, I will try to put this fundamental difference of Catholic and Protestant into a single phrase, which shall be this: All the best and wisest scholars are also the humblest, but the Catholic Church teaches her wise and humble scholars to thank God upon their knees for what they *know,* and the Protestant Churches teach their best men (the

men who are wise enough to be humble) to apologize to their brethren for what they *think*. There are arrogant Protestant scholars who sometimes state opinions quite too confidently. "All scholars are agreed" is one of their favorite phrases, and a particularly provoking phrase, for there are very few points on which all scholars do agree, and in regard to such points nobody cares to use such a phrase at all. But when you examine a Protestant theologian as to the grounds of his belief, you will generally find that in the field of religious enquiry he regards absolutely certain knowledge as a gift which God has not given to the creature, man.

IV. The Movement Moving: Some Features of the History of Protestantism. Protestant Infallibility.

But right here it is most important to note that this teaching, that Christians cannot *know anything for certain,* is a new growth in Protestantism. The Protestantism of three centuries and a half ago had no such modesty of uncertainty. What has made the change? I must ask you to study with me some features of the history of this Protestant Movement, before we survey its characteristics of the present time. Protestantism is the Prodigal Son of the Christian family. Let me not be mis-understood. I do not mean, in this, to say anything of my Protestant brethren that shall offend. Be it remembered that the Prodigal of the parable was greatly beloved by his father, greatly welcomed by his father, greatly honored and feasted at the family table. Let me, then, press one single point of resemblance to that so attractive character. Protestantism said, "Give me the portion of goods that falleth to me," and left the father's house. My point is that it *went out rich.* It took its full share of the family property. It took the Church's ancient Creeds, the Church's Priesthood, the Church's Sacraments, the Church's Scriptures, a large portion of the Church's theology. It did not accept the Church's valuation of some of these things. It began almost at once to throw them away,—in fact, to "waste its substance," according to our view of things. But I say again, "It *went out rich.*" The characteristic difference between Protestantism and Catholicism, at the moment when the cleavage began between the two systems, lay not in their respective possessions, but in their different ways of looking at

their possessions. Both systems held, for instance, that they possessed a treasure of absolutely certain truth. Catholicism found it in the Catholic Faith, delivered as a fundamental tradition by our Lord himself, and preserved, in the form of the Catholic Creeds, by the Church's infallible memory and understanding. Protestantism, filled with angry disappointment because of the human failures of the Church, which certainly were many and grievous, refused any longer to accept the Church as an infallible authority for *anything* even for a faithful memory of the delivered faith. It still held the Catholic Creeds to be true statements, and certainly important, but it rested its whole weight of certainty upon the Bible. The Bible was the Word of God and infallible. Certainty was there. Of course, it was perfectly obvious that men did not agree as to what the Bible meant, even as to points which were regarded as of fundamental importance by disputants on both sides. Where, then, was certainty, after all? The Protestantism of the 16th century came quickly to another step. The promise that the Holy Spirit should guide our Lord's followers into all necessary truth was not fulfilled, said Protestantism, to the visible Church, which was manifestly fallible and corrupt. It must be that it was fulfilled to each faithful believer. If a man were a true Christian, the Spirit would guide him to a right understanding of the written Word. With that idea in mind Protestant Churches felt sure of their ground. They made up lists of doctrines which they considered particularly important, and called such lists of their own devising by the old, Catholic name of "Creeds." They developed a habit of insisting that Churches which did not agree with their particular lists of things specially important were not Churches at all. In fact, each Protestant believer who felt certain ideas to be particularly important felt obliged also to deny the very name of Christian to any other believer who did not in those points agree with *him*.

V. The Later History of Protestantism: The Movement from Certainty to Uncertainty.

You will feel, perhaps, that this is ancient history which I am giving you, a by-gone story which has nothing to do with to-day. It is very *old* history, I acknowledge, thoroughly by-gone history, an out-moded form of thought. But it has

something to do with to-day, and indeed a great deal to do with to-day. For see what happened in God's providence to this self-satisfied Protestantism of long ago! First, there came an extraordinary growth of human learning, including that new habit of observing facts, collecting facts, verifying facts, arguing from facts, which we call "Science." And this growth of human learning had large, wide-reaching results. For one thing, it taught men increased respect for one another's minds. It forced men to see that other men might differ greatly from them in religion, and yet be great thinkers. It showed that other men might differ from them about religion, and yet be great helpers of the world. It taught men a new respect for the human mind as an instrument of study and discovery, and yet, in the very same great impulse, a deepening sense of the worthlessness of argument about things unknown as compared with observation,—in short, the worthlessness of opinions as compared with facts. It taught men to feel that when two serious students differed as to such an unverifiable notion as what particular meaning a third man had when he wrote certain words centuries ago, it was ridiculous for either disputant to claim for his own understanding an infallible certainty. In such an atmosphere the notion of the infallibility of the individual Christian believer shrivelled up and fell away. It is only among deeply uneducated people that it still survives. Naturally, then, as self-confidence diminished, as respect for other men's knowledge grew, as the difference between knowing things and only having opinions about things impressed itself more and more, the Protestant Churches came more and more to diminish the number of the things in which they required men to agree. Indeed, they not only diminished the number of things which they imposed as *necessary*. They withdrew some of the ideas which once they had written into their so-called "creeds," and threw them over as rubbish. Such has been the faith of the theological system known as Calvinism. Three hundred years ago it was part of the essential "creed" of almost all English-speaking Protestants, as well as of a large share of Continental Protestants. To-day, it is by most Protestants disowned and scorned, and by none required.

Now this process of simplification and reduction of Protestant "creeds" was, so far forth, a coming nearer to Cathol-

icism. Down to the middle of the 19th century this process of retrenchment in required beliefs had left Protestants, with exceptions still insignificant, holding most of the truths of the Catholic Faith. Almost all Protestants held the truths summarized in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, except for a certain dilution of the faith touching the Church and the Sacraments, and they were giving up the un-Catholic additions to the ancient faith, by which they had burdened men's souls. Seventy-five years ago, Protestantism was nearer to Catholicism than it has been at any other time in its history. It held most of the truths of the faith. It had ceased to insist on human opinions. That would have been a happy time for trying to bring about a Concordat between the two systems. But these last seventy-five years have brought to Protestantism another sweeping change of atmosphere, a change of mental habit, a change of essential character, which are nothing less than tremendous. I cannot take time to tell the story of the change. I must content myself with saying briefly that the critical study of the Scriptures, both of the Old Testament and the New, has made great advances, and that the result has been to shake the belief of Protestants in the infallibility of the Bible so powerfully that now in the Protestant world confidence in the infallibility of the Bible is following hard after the vanished confidence in the infallibility of every truly saved man.

But here it may be said truly that the changed view of Holy Scripture has affected Catholics as well as Protestants, and has affected both parties profoundly. Certainly, but it has not affected them alike. Catholics feel the presence of the human element in Holy Scripture much more deeply than they felt it fifty years ago. Catholics are ready to acknowledge the presence of human errors in Scripture books with a smiling readiness which they did not feel fifty years ago. But the Catholic Church has never set forth any particular theory of inspiration, and therefore is not now obliged to withdraw, or apologize for, any such theory. Furthermore, Catholics never rested their Church on the authority of the Bible. They rested the Bible on the authority of the Church. How did we Catholics *get* our Bible? It comes to us as a part of that great memory of the Church of which I have spoken. The Church remembers the Faith as given by our Lord in the

great Forty Days. The Church remembers the Bible as given to her keeping in two different ways, — the old Testament books by inheritance from the elder Church, with our Lord's attestation, the New Testament books as having been attested to her by the voices of her own prophets as somehow a gift from God, and as containing religious teachings that could be depended upon. We have learned that God does not care to save men who bring His messages of religious truth from making mistakes about utterly unimportant matters. We still accept the *religious* teaching as both important and true.

But with the Protestant the case is altogether different. Catholics have learned that God was willing that His Word ministered through men should contain errors about small things. Protestants find no security that a writer, even of the New Testament, may not be mistaken even as to some very great things.

The Nicene Creed speaks of the Holy Ghost as a Divine Person Who, in some special manner, "spoke by the prophets." S. Peter says that "holy men of old spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." We Catholics point to that supernatural guidance as the reason why the New Testament writers do not disagree, as modern religious teachers disagree. The Protestant thinker says that all good men of every age have in them a spirit which is from God. He says further that all good, earnest seekers after truth are moved by the Holy Ghost, all which is true. But he does not distinguish the New Testament writers as having not only *been moved,* but *spoken* as they were moved, by the Spirit of God. It follows that the typical modern Protestant does not see why any religious opinion of S. Paul or S. John should be taken as a guide of his personal thinking, any more than the religious opinions of his own favorite preacher of to-day. In fact, our average Protestant thinks that, after centuries of evolution, his modern preacher *ought* to be, and may very well be *supposed* to be, a much safer guide to-day than any Apostle of the Church's feeble first beginnings. That is the solemn difference between the situation of seventy-five years ago and the situation of to-day. Seventy-five years ago, almost all Protestants were sure of most of the fundamentals of religion. They were illogical about it. They had no just grounds on which to rest their certainty. But they had what they

thought to be good ground, and on that ground they stood squarely. *Now* Protestants have no security that any particular thing which is said in the Bible is true. There is error in it, they say. Then there may be error *anywhere* in it. My friend's phrase has become typical,—"I hold everything in the Bible to be inspired which is inspired to me!" You believe what you like. You believe nothing which you do **not** like. All certainty in religion is gone.

VI. Five Characteristics of the Protestant Movement, as one finds it To-day.

I have brought my history of the Protestant Movement to the present time. We have seen that Catholicism stands for certainty in religion,—certainty about some few things,—and Protestantism stands for *uncertainty* about *everything.* From this prevailing character of modern Protestantism come some other characteristics which I ask leave to pass in review. There are five of them, and the first to be named is

(1) Indefiniteness.

When a man becomes clearly conscious that he can never know certainly whether anything that he thinks is entirely true, it follows naturally that he will not know quite clearly what he *does* think. His mind does not work like a magnetic needle that points due north, but like a magnetic needle which has been exposed to disturbing influences from objects brought near to it, so that it quivers unsteadily, and jumps in all directions. Let me give you an illustration. A Protestant theologian may say that he believes in the Divinity of Christ. What does he mean by that statement? No mortal man can tell. Most probably he has very little idea of what he means, himself. I was talking, a few weeks ago, with a Congregationalist minister, one of my valued friends, a man particularly conservative and devout, and I mentioned that the Denomination known as "Congregationalist," and supposed to be Trinitarian, sheltered many ministers who were really Unitarian in belief. "Yes," he said, "the word 'divine' has so many shades of meaning that it is impossible to limit religious fellowship to persons who attach any one particular idea to that word." Speaking for myself as a Catholic I know no greater point of religious difference between seekers after

truth than this,—the difference between holding that Christ is God, and holding that Christ is not God. I know no question of religious belief which would seem more readily to *admit of* a definite answer, nor more imperatively to *require* a definite answer. Here was a thoughtful man, himself a believer in our Lord's Godhead, who was so little in the habit of thinking definitely that he could not imagine the word "Divine" tying a theologian to any definite belief about the Divine Man. I know well that there are Protestant theologians, especially in Scotland and England, who are very definite still as regards the central things of religion. But my point is that these conservatives represent the past of Protestantism, and not its future. The Protestant habit of mind is more and more habit of *feeling after truth,* of saying, "I think that the truth of the subject lies probably in such and such a direction." A Congregational minister once said to me of his belief in the doctrine of the Trinity, "I suppose that there is a sort of a three-ness." He thought that "Father," "Son," and "Holy Ghost" were words pointing to some mystery. He did not know what it was. He did not particularly care. He was quite sure that nobody could tell him, and that he could never, in this world, find it out.

Let me give you one more illustration. A Protestant theologian may say that he holds the doctrine of the Trinity. Who can tell what he means by **that** phrase? It may not mean the *Catholic Doctrine* of the Trinity. A graduate of a somewhat conservative Theological Seminary told me that his teacher of Dogmatic Theology, whom he reverenced particularly, thought that "Father," Son," and "Holy Ghost" were names of different aspects of the Godhead. "Thus," this good man would say,—"Thus I myself am at the same time the father of a family, a minister of the Gospel, and the friend and teacher of you young men." That is not a doctrine of "Three Persons in One God," but of "Three Persons in One Person," of a Person being three things at once, in different relations of life. It is also what is known to Catholic theologians as "the Sabellian heresy." To the indefinite mind it is an interesting suggestion for explaining the Doctrine of the Trinity.

I say again that there are Protestant teachers who have a strong and definite theology, but I add that they will have

few successors or at best a rapidly diminishing number of successors. The truly representative Protestant teacher of today has not a theology, but a frame of mind. And I must add here my solemn warning,—"You cannot make a covenant with a frame of mind." Our Protestant friends are feeling after truth, but no man can pledge himself to feel tomorrow as he feels to-day. This is a condition which our friends will not object to be charged with. They glory in it. And it is a part of this glorying in indefiniteness that they refuse to be bound by creeds. It is a matter of pride with them that they recognize the futility of such pledges of a future loyalty. They ridicule them as "promises to be unchangeable," "pledges that our minds shall not grow." It is not merely that they are not definitely sure that a particular thing is so to-day. They see (rightly enough) that by next year they may be pretty confident that it is not so. At any rate they will not be bound to any clearly marked and settled thought.

But a far more dangerous characteristic of Protestantism is

(2) Ambiguity.

When men cease to think clearly defined *thoughts,* they must inevitably cease also to attach definite meaning to *words.* He who is sure that men cannot *think* true, will of necessity despair of their being able to *speak* true. Words and phrases are men's feeble attempts to make pictures of what their minds have seen. A man's words cannot be more definite than his thoughts. Such is the modern Protestant view of the relation of words and thoughts. It is a view that comes out in my friend's remark about the "many shades of meaning" of the word "Divine." The Catholic would suggest a correction. The argument is mainly sound, but it overlooks the fact that words are the instruments of God's thoughts as well as man's. There is One Man in the world who is also God, and He has given us some things that we can know and some forms of words that have a meaning both definite and certain. And we might add that even in the use of ordinary words by ordinary men, men do succeed in using their poor human words definitely enough to make binding agreements with one another. It is quite common for men to make agreements which both sides are expected to understand, in which both

sides are expected to agree, and which can be interpreted with authority by a court of law, as to what they really do mean. Words are taken as having ascertainable meanings in the walks of our common life. But there is an increasing tendency among thinkers of the Protestant type to maintain that in religion words can never represent anything more than approximations to the truth, and therefore no forms of words can rightly be limited to any particular meaning. Here a direct issue is joined between Catholics and Protestants. "Fixedness of interpretation is of the essence of creeds." That is the Catholic view. I quote the phrase from the Pastoral Letter of our American Bishops in 1894. But it is now a common Protestant contention that "to impose any particular interpretation upon any clause of the Creed is to add to the Creed." I acknowledge with pain that I have taken this quotation also from an Episcopalian writer, no less a person than Dr. Headlam, now Regius Professor of Divinity in Oxford University. "To impose any particular interpretation upon any clause of the Creed is to add to the Creed." Dr. Headlam meant quite particularly that if a Bishop dealing with Clergymen or Ordination Candidates should insist that "born of the Virgin Mary" in the Apostles' Creed meant necessarily "born without human fatherhood," such a Bishop would be adding to the Creed!

I will spend no time in arguing whether it is, or it is not, *honest* to profess a Creed while one holds precisely the opinions which that Creed was intended to save men from holding. I will only say that when one is dealing with persons who do as a matter of fact hold this theory of ambiguity, the theory that no creed can justly be held to mean any particular thing rather than the opposite thing, one must recognize that with such persons the subscribing of a creed can never be a safeguard of any belief, nor yet a test of the subscriber's actual opinions.

Let me give you two examples of the working of this new mental habit of "ambiguity." The first may be of interest as showing that this "new" habit is not so very new, after all, for the illustration comes from sixty years ago. I have been told that the great Congregationalist thinker, Dr. Horace Bushnell, once said, "I can subscribe any creed that ever was put forth by any Christian Church." The idea seems

to be that all creedal statements were but attempts to express the inexpressible, and therefore any man had a right to read his own aspiring thoughts into any formula that the wit of man could devise.

My second example is taken out of my own experience. A high-minded and generous gentleman, a Congregationalist minister, whom I knew and valued a few years since, stated his view of the Divinity of our Lord in a printed paper in these words, "I recognize in Jesus the divinity that is in all men." That was a frankly Unitarian statement. If one is to search among ancient definitions of "shades of meaning," it would have been called in the 4th century "Anomaean." It would have made such a moderate heretic as Arius feel dissatisfied. But this same thoughtful and most conscientious student once told me that he should have no difficulty in saying the Nicene Creed! I may add that he told me also that when it came to the Apostles' Creed he should feel uncomfortable. Can you see his point? This good and fine man felt that the Nicene Creed was written in the language of theologians, and he had come to regard the phrases of theologians as arrows shot into the air, not to be understood as having any fixed value. The Apostles' Creed struck him as being written in the language of the plain man, the speech of every day. He did not believe those things, and he was not going to say so. Our concern, our painful concern, is that an increasing number of theologians are claiming the privilege of accepting, and saying, not only Protestant Confessions, but our old Catholic Creeds, when their inner thoughts are just opposite in places to the thoughts which those Creeds were framed to express.

A very distinguished Congregational minister, a former Moderator of their Triennial National Council, and I may add, a prominent representative of Congregationalism at the Conference on Faith and Order held at Geneva, last August, has recently been urging the reunion of Congregationalists and Unitarians. Their difference, Dr. Nehemiah Boynton told them, was "solely an intellectual difference." That would seem to mean that to this good man no matters of religious belief are of fundamental importance in the ordering of a man's life. The difference between worshipping the Lord Jesus and not worshipping Him is a mere difference of opin-

ion. There follows from such thinking a third characteristic of our modern Protestantism,

(3) The Substitution of Morality for Religion.

In this age of scientific accuracy men are justly impatient of guess-work. They don't want opinions. They want facts. A member of the Faculty of a great College said once in my hearing, "When I go to Church, I don't want to be instructed. I want to have my feeling for right things stimulated. I should feel insulted, if a preacher tried to instruct me from the pulpit." I think that the more thoughtful Protestant teachers argue in their hearts—perhaps only half-consciously, sometimes,—that, as Almighty God has not given to man any possibility of making sure that anything is true, it must be that the truth is not one of man's essential needs. If a man can never be sure of getting any religious opinions right, why should he bother himself with religious opinions at all? Why should he *have* any? Why should he *hear* any? The one important thing is to do right. Let the pulpit occupy itself with justice and mercy, and let truth go.

Of course, there will always be men who are essentially thinkers. They *must* think. They believe that seeking truth perpetually is one of the ennobling pursuits of life, no matter how much one may stumble and fall, as one presses forward along the climbing way. They must think, and they must think about God. But these are the minority. For the average man Protestantism teaches duty as a general thing, and lets doctrine go. Catholicism teaches, on the other hand, that Almighty God *has* given men something in the way of truth that they can be sure of, and goes on to argue that inasmuch as God has taken pains to give his people a gift of certain truth, it must be that they need to receive that gift, and use it. God would not have given it to them, if there was not some great use and value in it. Our Lord speaks of His Father as having hidden some things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes. This great mass of the world's people who are, comparatively speaking, babes rather than philosophers,—for them the Catholic Church holds a treasure of truth in trust. And the Catholic Church goes on to claim that you cannot have true *religion,* which includes worship of God and fellowship with God, unless God stoops to

make Himself known to men and to give Himself to men. I must not stop to argue which is right. I only say that it is a patent fact that Protestant pulpits as a rule teach duty, and do not teach doctrine. And if any Protestant brother complains that I spoke of substituting morality for *religion,* I say to him that I hear from every side in Protestant circles a gasping cry that somehow the Churches do lack religion. "Worship, a lost Art" is a phrase with which Protestantism is familiar. I make hold to say that the neglect of assured doctrinal teaching in any Church leads inevitably to the decay of religion itself. And the decay is there before men's eyes. Protestantism acknowledges that it is harder and harder for it to get men to go to Church. It keeps asking over and over, "Why *don't* men go to Church? "And the simple answer is, "Men do not go to church, because they have not been taught religion."

But even a deeper failure of Modern Protestantism is that which I shall name as its fourth characteristic,—

(4) Its Failure to Offer Remedies for Sin.

Some of my Protestant friends would want to cry out against me, if they heard me say such a thing as that; but it would be because they did not understand what it was that I had in mind. I am not speaking now of the *forgiveness* of sins, but of *salvation* out of the habit of sin. As to forgiveness, Protestants are much divided. The older school still clings to the idea of atonement by a sacrificial death. The newer school teaches that God is bound by His own love to forgive all sins of all men, and that no machinery of atonement is required. I pass that subject by, to point out that Protestantism offers men no means of grace to help them to escape out of the *habit* of sinning. It tries to bring them to be on God's side by conversion. It tells them that having chosen God's side they ought now to live on God's side. What can it do to help them? It sets before them the help of prayer, the help of Bible study, the help of Church attendance, the help of fellowship of Christian men and women. But it offers no Sacrament of Absolution, to set them free from their own failures, no Sacrament of Life, to empower them and strengthen them for their new course, no Sacrament of the Seven Gifts of the Indwelling Spirit of God. It naturally

follows that in the preaching of Protestant Churches there is a defect of the teaching that Christian life should be a life of growth. Doubtless many Protestants feel deeply that all life must be a growing thing. Doubtless from many Protestant pulpits men are urged to watch over themselves to see that they do grow in grace. But in the Protestant pulpit taken broadly, I think that it is a plain fact that there is a defect of insistence upon this divine fact of life, that *life must grow.* At any rate, there is what must seem to us Catholics a tragical defect of *helps* to grow. There is a great deal of admirable moral teaching. Men are told that they ought to do what is right, shown finely what is finely right, in many lines, but when it comes to the solemn question, "What shall we do, when we fail?" I think that Protestantism has generally no answer but the answer of the old Pelagian heresy,—"If a man really wants to do right, he *can* do right. All that you have to do is to make up your mind to do the right thing, and go on and do it." "Means of Grace" are to Protestantism things unknown, undreamed of.

But the hope of glory! Ah! *That* our Modern Protestantism has in large measure. The fifth characteristic, the last which I shall name, is—

(5) Its Habit of Regarding Death as a Sacrament of Life.

I think that you will not at once understand that heading. Let me state it in another way. Protestantism leads men to look for salvation through getting rid of their bodies. Further to clear up what I mean, I must talk a little theology. Catholicism teaches men that their hope of everlasting life, and so of everlasting happiness, is in receiving a gift of new life from above, in fact, a share in the very life of Jesus, the God-Man. We Catholics are taught that we receive that life in our Baptism, that when we lose our hold on that gift, we are restored by our Absolutions, that we gain fresh power and enlargement of that life in our Communions. Our Christian life, we are told, consists in learning to live in the power of our Lord's life, and not in our own. Protestantism teaches men, on the other hand, that their hope of life is in the education, the training, the discipline, the purging, if need be, of the life that is their own. Catholicism teaches men to bring everlasting life down from God, and make it their own. Protestant-

ism teaches men to lift up their own life, and make it everlasting. What, then, will happen, when we die? The Catholic is taught that nothing but a perfect life can enter Heaven. But the life in which he has been living for years is the perfect life of the Son of God. As a Christian he has been trying to purge himself of all the forces of life that were his own, and live only in those of the Crucified and Glorified Lord. His hope is that God will give him now a larger purging, in fact, a complete purging, till only the life of Jesus is left. He cannot think that that complete purgation can be accomplished all at once, but in that purgation is his hope. "Ye are dead," is his motto, "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." The Protestant comes to die, and if he be a religious man at all, he must feel that he is not ready for the Presence of God. Perhaps he has been faithfully struggling to make himself a good servant of God for years. Perhaps he is conscious that he has never given much attention to God in all his life. But he has been a good citizen, a good husband and father, a good friend and neighbor. He is sure that God, the All-Loving, will not cast him away. What *can* he think? He remembers the funeral services that he has attended, the things that choirs have sung, the things that preachers of funeral sermons have said. He has been taught that the death of all good, respectable people admits them to a state of perfect happiness. If he is in the least thoughtful, he must realize that a perfect happiness cannot be except in a perfect life. I will give Protestantism the credit of still emphasizing *that* idea. But now the man knows himself painfully *imperfect*. He is shut up to one conclusion,—the passage through death must be a passage from imperfection to perfection. The soul has an affinity for God, and when it is parted from the hampering flesh, it will be straightway assimilated to God. I do not mean to say that this has been taught by any Protestant teacher in so many words. I do not suppose that it has been thought out. But the atmosphere of Protestantism is filled with an undefined feeling about death, a less than conscious attitude toward death, such as I have tried to indicate. And I hold that the harm of it is great. We Catholics have been accused of teaching "salvation by sacraments," and of having a *magical* notion of sacraments. But at least we constantly insist that sacraments (except in

the case of the unconscious infant) bring no help and no value to any person that does not meet them with a right disposition of the soul, with faith and repentance and a solemn purpose of surrender to the will of God. And our whole conception of sacraments is that they are gifts of power given to be turned to use, and depending on the using. We have dreamed of such a thing as a sacrament that could transform an imperfect life into a perfect life in a moment of time, and without any corresponding efforts of the receiver. Such a view of the effect of the parting of soul and body is magical indeed. *Mors, Janua Vitae,* is a fine old Latin saying. "Death is the Gate of Life." As it was meant, it is profoundly true. Death is the gate of life to every soul that passes through that gateway fortified and enriched with the indwelling Life of God. But I know no more poisonous teaching current in the world today than that which allows men to think of death as a doorway to which the man may approach who has not the Life of God, and passing through, find life,—just his own life, transfigured,—on the other side.

VII. The End. The Movement has Moved from Certainty to Uncertainty. It Must Move on from Uncertainty to Unbelief.

To what end is Protestantism moving? It has moved, I have said, from Certainty to Uncertainty. And now at last the Protestant man is beginning to know that he does not know. He has been uncertain, increasingly doubtful about his belief, for two generations. Now he is fully conscious that there is nothing in religion that he can really know. But when you have no reason to *know* a thing you cannot *believe* it. This is a point which I must press upon you. I ask your best attention to it. Belief is accepting a thing as true on the authority of someone else who says that it is true. You may believe a thing on very insufficient authority. But to believe a thing is to take it for true on authority somehow, on the strength of some testimony that you think worthy of belief. Believing is accepting a thing on testimony which seems to entitle you to be sure. When you know that you have no reason to be sure of a thing, you may persuade yourself to *think* it, but you cannot *believe*. But what happens when men have believed something for years on the authority of a witness,

and then find out gradually that that witness is not worthy of credit? Why perhaps they will go on believing his story for a good while, because they have been in the habit of accepting it, and nobody reminds them that it was because of that authority that they first came to believe. That happens in religion. When men have lost old foundations of belief out of their minds, they will, as a general thing, go on for a good while believing whatever they have formed a habit of believing in their youth. An age-long tradition of believing certain things gathers momentum in any community, and momentum is a force that cannot be annihilated when it meets an obstacle. It has *somehow* continuing effect. What any group of religious men have long believed they will go on believing for a while, even after their grounds for believing those same things are entirely gone. But in the long run reason *will* assert itself against such an irrational tradition. When the foundations on which beliefs once rested are gone out of men's minds, men will, I say again, go on believing as they did before—*for a while.* But as they grow to be conscious that they know nothing, and have no grounds for knowing, in the next generation, or in a few generations at the most, belief will disappear. It is an end inevitable. Unbelief must come.

I have compared the Protestant movement to a stream. It is a stream of tendency. When it started with the rejection of the authority of the Catholic Church as a witness to the Catholic Faith, it started on a line which led by logical consequence to the denial of *all* authority. It set up a notion of individual infallibility of every true Christian, and that notion is gone. The defenders of that idea are historical curiosities. The idea of an infallible Bible is fast going. One can predict its total disappearance out of the Protestant world, as confidently as an astronomer can predict a total eclipse of the sun. I add another confident prediction. The end to which Protestantism leads, the end toward which it is fast going, is the entire extinction from what men may still call "religion," of anything that can be described as "belief."

This will seem to some Protestant friends of mine, if they shall ever see what I have written here, a hard saying. They will look at the great company of noble souls who are to-day enlisted in the service of Religion under the banner of Pro-

testantism, and they will say, "A movement led by such prophets will never be suffered by Almighty God to go down to such an end." In reply to that protest I have just two words to say. The first is that when a movement takes a wrong course, prophets cannot stay it from going on to the inevitable result. Judaism had prophets, but Judaism took the wrong turn, and had to be set aside from making history. The second is that there are no real endings in God's world. Men's endings are God's beginnings. I hold the Protestant Movement to be a movement of noble forces following a wrong direction. I am sure that the movement will have to be set aside and left behind in God's making of history, but those "noble forces" of which I spoke will have their recognized place in God's great History of the World. "Protestantism," the scheme, will die. But the work of its saints and sages and martyrs will live. Schemes may end, but great souls and their gifts to God will find their place in a work which lives on forever.

5.

The Full Catholic Faith the Need in the Present World Unrest

NO argument is needed to establish the fact that the present world unrest invades every geographical zone and every area of human thought and life, both individual and social. The present unrest is universal. From Europe comes an S. O. S., to America, the anguished cry of great peoples who seem to hear the "galloping thud of the Angel of Death hastening down the corridor of Time." In the words of Mr. Lowes Dickenson, "Europe, caught in the net of the treaties, financially bankrupt, distracted by civil and international war, threatens to perish in anarchy." "We are nearer to this," he says, "than America realizes. It is a question of a few years, perhaps of a few months." He says this threatening anarchy is making its red way not only in Russia, but through Asia Minor, and Syria, and Mesopotamia, and Persia, and India, with the order built up in centuries and milleniums, disappearing in decades. In America, to quote from the President's inaugural address the other day, the world's travail has left us "involved in a delirium of expenditure, in expanded currency and credits, in unbalanced industry, unspeakable waste and disturbed relationships." The prevailing note in our life in America, as in the life abroad, is the hysterical note of the Jazz. In our ideals, political, industrial, commercial, domestic and even religious, we seem to be not marching ahead vigorously, effectively, but rather,—to borrow a word from our most modern popular idea of Terpsichorean art,—"doing the Toddle."

Faith is the need of the world to-day—faith in a moral universe which cannot be overturned by immoral men, faith in men as something other than super-beasts; faith in a God whose will marches steadily along overturning the devices of wicked men, bringing their counsels to nought, putting down the mighty from their seat, exalting the humble and meek, coercing even evil to ultimate good and hastening on the coming of His Kingdom on earth even as it is in heaven; faith in

a Saviour who will not fail and who will not be discouraged until righteousness is established and the isles wait for His law.

Faith is vision. Faith is valor. Faith is patient. Faith is dauntless.

"Faith sees the best that glimmers through the worst;
Faith feels the sun is hid but for a night;
Faith spies the summer through the winter bud;
Faith tastes the fruit before the blossom fails,
Faith hears the lark within the songless egg,
Faith finds the fountain where they sighed, mirage."

"Faith," to use the Moffatt translation, "means we are confident of what we hope for, convinced of what we do not see."

The Faith, however, that is adequate to meet a world unrest, must be a big faith, a faith with terms big enough and Catholic enough to envision all, to validate and sanction all our highest yearnings, to bring an authentic confidence and conviction to the whole man, to all sorts and conditions of men, to illuminate every department of human life and to fertilize and vitalize every area of individual and social conduct.

(1) There is already in the world such a faith, a faith tested and approved by those of every age and of every racial strain who have found in the Christian experience the sesame to peace. It is a *Catholic* Faith,—a faith common to all signed with the Cross, a faith that overleaps national boundaries, that knows no lines isothermal, that breaks down walls of racial partition, that loses nothing in international exchange, that suffers no discount by crossing a frontier either on the map or in the mind, that changes only that it may never change, that is solid because it is true, and majestic because it is divine, and vital because it is human, the Faith once for all delivered to the saints, the Faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Faith of His Body, of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, summed up in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.

That Faith is not, as so many people think, primarily a dogma. It is not a weight of ecclesiastical *obiter dicta,* it is not an accumulation of cold, dead formulae, thrust upon us by authority with a "Take this or be damned!" It is primarily

a pragma, an experience from which has been distilled a belief. It is the autobiography of all Christian Life, it is a plain statement of what Christians,—all Christians,—have experienced and therefore tested everywhere, always, from the beginning. *It is not copied from grave-stones of dead debates. It is warm with human lives who are living it. It is hot from the pressure it has given to-day to human action. If you cut any part of it, it bleeds.*

I know the prejudice against creeds. "Give me," says many a man, "a religion, a Christianity without a creed, and I shall accept it. We are sick of creeds; what we want is the living Christ. We care nothing for your metaphysical speculations, your hair-splitting theological definitions, your elaborate credal shibboleths! We want:

> 'Not the Christ of your subtle creeds,
> But the light of our hearts and homes,
> Of our hopes and prayers and needs,—
> The Brother of want and blame,
> The Lover of women and men,
> With a love that puts to shame
> All passions of mortal ken'."

I sympathize with that man. What he wants is the living Christ with whom he may live. And we all want Him and must have Him. That is the very centre of the Catholic faith, and all else in our Faith flows from the experience of "Christ in us the hope of Glory." But I must answer him,—Brother, would you say,—"Away with your astronomical creeds and give me the simple stars?" Would you banish botany to gain the flowers of the field? Would you denounce Newton's law for the sake of keeping your feet on the ground, or draw a deadly antithesis between the cold creed of monogamy and the warm comfort of a home? A religion without a creed is an anomaly and an impossibility. A faithless religion is,—well, "faithless." You slay the noun with the adjective. You let the blood of the subject with the murderous thrust of the modifier. Christianity without a definite, Catholic Faith would be, or rather would have been, a mere shudder of ephemeral emotion, a feeble and invertebrate movement within Judaism, unable to perpetuate itself and without a chance to weather the storms of the ages.

(2) I have claimed for this Faith the word Catholic. I

have claimed that it is the panacea for the world unrest. Large claims are these, and now to substantiate them.

(a) What, after all, is the seat of the world's unrest? And I hear as from afar the trumpet voice of Thomas Carlyle, —"The trouble with our times is that men have forgotten God." Aye, and man is in a torment of unrest till he recover God, or, rather, till God recover him. Men may not realize it, but they are made for God nevertheless, and are restless till they rest in Him. It is contact with Him that they need. All the lines of their being run ravenously out seeking and searching and feeling after Him, who is the perfect Goodness and Beauty and Truth. Their souls are athirst for God, for the living God. When you are considering facts, you must, as Myall reminded Huxley, consider *all* the facts, and this hunger for God is the greatest, the most significant fact in the history of the race. It includes all your sciences, all your arts, all your philosophies, all your prayers, all your aspirations, all your ideals,—the stretch of the soul out into the Infinite to get hold of Reality itself. The Catholic Faith is not satisfied with asserting the existence of God, it does not propose to us as an object of faith a somewhat "not ourselves that makes for righteousness," a fountain of infinite energy, a blazing centre of eternal bliss, or a grey absolute, or a cosmic all-in-all. The Catholic Faith is that God is *personal,* with all that the word involves in human life, only raised to the *n*th power; that He is infinite intelligence, infinite will and infinite love. He is both transcendent and immanent; "above all, not as abstracted but as presiding over all; beneath all, not as abased but as sustaining all; within all, not as enclosed but filling all; without all, not as excluded, but enveloping all;" He is a social being having within Himself as God a triune mystery of fellowship so awful, so sublime that human thought can but come to the edge of the idea and catch a glimpse of glories no man is permitted to see, much less to utter.

(b) Unutterable, until—until the Son that is in the bosom of the Father, Himself reveals to us the heart of the life and love of God by being made flesh and dwelling among us. "In Him was life and the life was the light of men and the light shineth in the darkness and the darkness comprehended it not." "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." Jesus

is God, not as a proposition at the end of an argument, but as the life of God made available for human needs. To know him is to know what God is like. To hear Him is to know what God is saying to us. To watch Him in His reaction to sin, to suffering and to death is to know what God cares about sin and suffering and death. And He, God in human nature, calls out to a restless world, "Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy-laden and I will give you rest!"

Jesus! There is the center of the Catholic Faith. No one can fail to see that Christianity is Christ. Its chief festivals mark the great events in His earthly career; its symbol is the Cross on which He died; its initiatory rite is one of incorporation into Him; its supreme mystery is a sacrament of communion with Him; its secret peace and power is identification with Him. Who is He? What is He?

> "Above the heroes, prophets, poets, saints,
> In Thy great personality remote,
> August and sadly smiling at our doubts,
> Elusive, yet beside our thought alway,
> Thou who art still the loneliest of men,
> Thou paradox and potent mystery,
> So hated and so loved,—Who art thou Christ?"

And Bernard Shaw replies: "He is the central superstition of Christianity." And Emerson replies: "He is the noxiously exaggerated hero of Christianity." And Nietzsche replies: "He is the despicably weak Saviour." And the German Modernist: "He is the pathetic failure of a young Jewish idealist and reformer." And Swinburne: "He is the pale Galilean and the world has grown grey with his breath." But to John, the Apostle, He is "the light and the life of men"; to Thomas, his friend, He is "my Lord and my God." To Paul: "all things are created through Him and unto Him. And He is before all things and by Him all things consist." Listen to His own words: "Before Abraham was, I am; I came forth from the Father and am come into the world; again I leave the world and go unto the Father. I and my Father are one. He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Was He a man? He was. A historic figure? Yes. A great teacher? Yes. But all attempted explanations of Him on the basis of ordinary human laws leave us intellectually bankrupt. He is the infinite expansion of the social consciousness, not of a race, but of all men. Every race has its own characteristics. Moses

is Jewish; Confucius is Chinese of the Chinese; Aristotle is Greek through and through; Shakespeare is Anglo-Saxon; Goethe is German; Hugo is French; Emerson is American. Each carries with him his national tone and character. But Christ has "stretched the local and transient into the universal and eternal. We have only one man of such capacious dimensions that he keeps His stride from race to race, from century to century, clearing all national limitations, destroying prejudices rooted in the immemorial past, widening blind alleys of ignorance into endless highways of wisdom, deepening the flowing tides of good will among men, lifting the very gates of death off their hinges; and setting the jubilant feet of the race in the pathways that wind onward and upward into life eternal."

He is never out of date. His speech has in it the freshness of this morning. Science does not qualify it. Philosophy does not push it into the discard:

> "All the peoples meet in Him,
> And he makes the nations one,
> Other splendors must grow dim,
> In the light of Mary's Son."

He is unique in the perfectness of His human life. And yet He is the one great impenitent of all history. He is never faintly conscious of wrong doing. He says, with great simplicity "which of you convicteth me of sin?" Yet he leaves upon us the impression of a humility absolute, of a character untouched by the faintest shade of that self-esteem which tricks and deceives in self-appraisal.

(3) There are three great centres of human life where man's restlessness is created, where pain and anguish pierce and hurt and burn. One is the sense of guilt of sin, another is physical suffering, and the third is death. And the Catholic Faith meets all of these by providing contact with God, through Jesus Christ.

(a) There is a difference between evil and sin. Evil is the wrong in the world, whether we recognize it or not. Sin is the wrong that we recognize and feel. I know the euphemisms for sin. It is called "natural instinct" and "human weakness" and "self-expression" and "fate" and "bad luck," and "temperament," and so forth. But our deeper self knows that it is the free choice by a free life to do wrong. And the great

solemn, awful tragedy of the race is just here. It is futile to try to account for the present restlessness of the world by talk of political mal-adjustments, of economic mal-adjustments, of social mal-adjustments and the like. To prophetic insight such explanations are as incomplete as that a man in New Orleans should account for the Mississippi river by saying that it came from Memphis, or that a man in Memphis should explain it by saying it came from St. Louis. They speak truly so far as they go, but they have not traced the river back to its original source. It really rises from many springs far up in the Rockies. And it is from the hidden ranges of our human life, insurmountable and obscure, from the inner thoughts and meditations of the human heart, from the elusive qualities of our spirits, and the emphases of our desires "flow down the resultant destinies of human kind." Sin is the greatest source of all our restlessness. It is the darkening of our eye, the destruction of our vision, the poison that hardens our spiritual arteries, the curse that robs the life of its song, the sag of character and the reversion to lower type. All great literature reflects the restlessness that sin creates:—Macbeth, Hamlet, Othello, Faust, Les Miserables, Romola, the Scarlet Letter, the Seventh Chapter of Romans: "O, wretched man that I am. Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

> "Me miserable! Which way I fly is Hell; myself am Hell,
> And in the lowest deep a lower deep
> Still threatening to devour me opens wide,
> To which the Hell I suffer seems a heaven!"

The Catholic Faith has something to say to the restlessness of sin: "I believe in the forgiveness of sins!" Not that Jesus condones them or overlooks them, or conceals their effects, or overturns the moral laws of the universe. Far from that. God has a conscience, as man has, only infinitely more delicate and sharp and sensitive. And He has united His life to man. We are made in His image, and "in Him we live and move and have our being." And when we sin the pain reaches God and hurts and wounds, yes,—as Christianity says—crucifies Him. Every sin "crucifies the son of God afresh." But when the will freely turns back, changes its direction, it does not create forgiveness, any more than it creates the Love of God. It only appropriates what was there always. It only

makes possible the healing flow of that which sin inhibited before. "If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous, and He is the propitiation." "I thought once," wrote a British Soldier, "that the two races facing each other, reviling each other even in their anguish, were as the two thieves on the cross, and that somewhere between them, if we could but see, was Christ on His Cross. For He is the conscience of God; and he is the conscience of the whole family of the less conscientious children of God; He is the unveiling for us of the Father's conscience; and He is the sin bearer of the world."

"All woes of all men sat upon Thy soul,
And all their wrongs were heavy on Thy head;
With all their wounds Thy heart was pierced and bled;
And in Thy spirit as in a mourning scroll
The world's huge sorrows were inscribed by roll.
All theirs on earth who serve and faint for bread,
All banished men's, all theirs in prison dead."

It was His kinship with them that took Him down into the uttermost darkness where He felt himself abandoned. "My God! My God! Why hast Thou forsaken Me?" The Catholic Faith proclaims as central not only Christ, but Christ crucified, Christ the Sin-bearer, "Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins."

(b) And then there is the physical suffering. O, the restlessness and anguish in the world that comes from pain and disappointment and sorrow! The sweat of the brow, the sweat of the brain, the sweat of the heart! There is only one cure for that. And that is conscious contact with the infinite source of vigor and health and strength; conscious contact with the power that can flood the body and the mind with currents of healing, and can change the life from one of conscious inferiority to one of conscious superiority. It is this that makes St. Paul so tremendously powerful in spite of physical weakness. It is this that puts a song in St. Francis' mouth and brings happiness welling out of his heart while wedded to his Lady Poverty. It is this that brings music out of all of life's remainders, after the break has come; that wins the battle with what is left from a defeat. Going blind, Milton goes on to write his sublimest poetry; going deaf Beethoven goes to compose his superb sonatas; being reared in an Alms House, Henry M. Stanley goes on until a nation

honors him with burial in Westminster Abbey. Jesus is not only forgiveness, but he is power, victory, triumph over weakness and incapacity and failure.

(c) And then there is the problem of death and the restlessness that comes from fear of it. The other day I had a debate with the President of the American Spiritualist Association upon the subject of Spiritism. Is that a panacea for the pathetic plaintive cry of the world "for the touch of a vanished hand, and the sound of a voice that is still?" Is it? One has only to read the literature of the cult; one has only to see the faces of its devotees; one has only to visit psychopathic wards and insane asylums to find that Spiritism and Occultism are but feeding and fostering the tortured restless craving of bereavement for assurance and light. They are on the wrong course. They seek communication with the dead. Jesus came to establish communion with God; not to re-assure our hearts by gathering us about Lazarus, but by gathering us to Himself who is the "Resurrection and the Life." His way, is the way, not of the seance, but of the Divine Supper, not of the cabinet but of the cup, not of spirits, but of spiritual communion with Him. The faith of Christianity is not the message of an esoteric cult, but the message of Easter Day, the promise of "the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come."

(4) You will note that I have so far said not a word of the Holy Catholic Church and the Holy Spirit of Jesus, who makes that Church the effective medium of His pardon and grace, the effective embodiment and instrument of His life.

I have been emphasizing contact with God through Jesus Christ as the one certain cure of the restlessness arising from sin and sickness and fear. Now if God can and does forgive sins, how does he assure me of it? If he can and does communicate strength to the human body and blood, how can I confidently avail myself of these amazing gifts? If communion with Him does transcend communications with spirits, where and how is such communion available?

It is cruel to raise one's hopes by promises unless one can go on to point the definite way to their fulfillment.

Well, Jesus himself provided a way whereby He might be just as available to men and women of the twentieth century or the fortieth century as He was to the men and women of

the first; just as accessible in North America or South Africa or Siberia as He was in Galilee or Judea. He ascended into Heaven only to descend in spiritual presence and power upon his apostles at Pentecost. His life is continued sacramentally. His spirit still inhabits a body; that mystical body is, as St. Paul never wearies in repeating, the Church,—"the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." It is Jesus ever contemporary. To enter it by Baptism is to be incorporated into Him; to come weary and heavy laden to her seeking peace is to come to Him;—it is His voice that speaks through the priest of the Church, saying to the penitent even as of old "Thy sins be forgiven thee; go and sin no more." They are His hands that reach out through the hands of the Bishop in blessing upon the head of the boy or girl coming to confirmation; it is His healing touch that is communicated to the sick through the Holy Unction of His Body, the Church; it is His voice that speaks at the altar the awful words "This is my Body; this is my Blood;" it is His life that is communicated to us in that supreme sacrament of His love, the Holy Communion wherein we "so eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and drink His blood that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body and our souls washed through His most precious blood and that we may evermore dwell in Him and He in us." Jesus is all in all, "the Way, the Truth and the Life;" and the sacraments of the Church are none other than the differentiated organs or foci of the Body, each with its own particular fitness for communicating the life of Jesus, the grace of Jesus, the *creative, strengthening, pardoning, healing, nourishing, unifying, ordaining union with Jesus according to the human need.*

That these adjectives are not chosen at random, let me for a moment identify each with a definite sacrament.

(a) **Creative: Holy Baptism.** The church properly calls it regeneration, a new birth, because being "born of water and of the Spirit," as the Master said, we "enter into the Kingdom of God." By Baptism we enter the Church—it is the only way of entrance. We are "received into Christ's Holy Church and be made living members of the same." In other words, we are Christianed or Christened; "we put off the old man and put on the new." We are in Baptism become "new creatures in Christ Jesus." We are given a Christian

name and as by our first birth we became members of a family, citizens of a country, responsible sharers in the life of the race, so by the new birth we become members of another family or fellowship, citizens of a heavenly country and sharers in the life of the Beloved Community of Christ.

(b) Strengthening: Holy Confirmation. Hands are very mysterious appendages of the body; they are away out on the frontiers of it, most remote from the brain centre, but what amazing sacraments they are, let us say, of industry, of painting, of music, of authorship, but supremely of friendship and love! There is not one of us, I suppose, who would not seek the cure for restlessness and weakness, if only we could, by touching hands with the wonderful hands of Christ. There is not one of us probably who has not again and again found himself humming:

"I wish that His hands had been placed on my head,
That His arms had been thrown around me."

Holy Confirmation is nothing short of this — that the Chief Shepherd and Bishop of our souls does actually touch us with His human hands because the Bishop's hands are not only his but *His*. The gifts that come to us in Confirmation are just what we might expect from the hands of Jesus laid upon us,—"manifold gifts of grace; the spirit of wisdom and understanding; the spirit of counsel and ghostly strength, the spirit of knowledge and true godliness, and the spirit of Thy holy fear."

(c) Pardoning: Holy Penance. If Jesus once forgave sins, He still does. If He once accompanied that forgiveness with human words of assurance, I may assume that He still does. If He said to His apostles "whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained," then I am not surprised to find in the service of His Body, the Church, that the Bishop the successor of the Apostles, says to the newly ordained priest "whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." But, objects some one, can a man forgive sins? Ah, you misunderstand. It is the Son of Man who still "hath power on earth to forgive sins." The priest is but the organ of that mystical Body, the Church, which

Jesus has made forever the social extension of His love and pardon and grace. It is

> "The voice of Jesus that I hear:
> His are the hands stretched out to draw me near;
> And His the blood that doth for sin atone,
> And sets me faultless there before His throne."

(d.) Healing: Holy Unction. To touch but the hem of the Saviour's garment brought healing to the woman with the issue of blood; to touch but some article identified with the bodies of His Apostles meant healing to those sick ones recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. Today the many modern cults of healing witness to the restlessness and longing of the sick to have the Gospel of the Kingdom preached to them. Jesus once healed; why does He not heal now? *He does!* It is as true today as it was of old that grace goes out of Him through His Body to our bodies. And if the Church be his mystical Body, then there must be grace flowing from Him through her to the bodies as well as the souls of men. There is. On Maundy Thursday, the Bishops of the Church bless, as they have ever blessed, the Holy Oil for the anointing of the sick. It only remains for you and me to claim the promise of St. James, "If any be sick among you, let him send for the elders of the Church and let them anoint him with oil in the Name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he have sins they shall be forgiven him."

(e.) Nourishing: Holy Communion. And what shall we say of this supreme social act of the mystical Body of Christ wherein it is built up and nourished in its several parts by the communication of His own spiritual Body and Blood? "There is but one thing necessary," cries Amiel, "and that is to possess God!" How can man, himself a sacrament, with an "outward and visible" and an "inward and spiritual," lay hold upon God, who is Spirit, except God be incarnate in a body? And how again shall man lay hold upon the Incarnate, really to possess Him, unless He come by way of a sacrament, which shall have an outward and visible sign, as well as an inward spiritual *res* or reality?

To quote the Catechism of the Church—

"What is the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper?" "Bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received."

"What is the inward part or thing signified?" "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

"What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?" "The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine."

Read the sixth chapter of the Gospel according to St. John; then read the account of the Institution of the Holy Communion in the twenty-second Chapter of St. Luke's Gospel; then turn to St. Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians, the eleventh chapter, and read verses twenty-three to thirty; then turn to the history of the Church from the beginning to find the great, central dominant focus of worship and of fellowship; then turn to your own Church and realize that He is still reaching out to meet you and identify His life with yours, to feed you, to strengthen and refresh you with His own life and to do all this not to you coming alone, but coming as one of a fellowship, of the Body which as a whole derives all its life from Him.

Alan Seeger, the gallant young American who gave his life at Belloy en Santerre, wrote lines that are famous on his "Rendezvous with Death." Let me paraphrase it, with lines on the Christian's rendezvous with Life:

I have a rendezvous with Life,
Within the Blessed Sacrament;—
When over me the priest is bent,
And Jesus comes, amazing fair,
I have a rendezvous with Life,
For he has promised to be there.

"I know I am not worthy thus,
To take his life mysterious;
My sins are higher than a hill,
His love is deeper than the sea,—
And so in my communion still,
I find His Mercy healeth me,
And I to my pledged word am true;
I will not fail that rendezvous!

(f) Unifying: Holy Matrimony. "An honorable estate," says our marriage service, "instituted of God in the time of man's innocency signifying unto us the *mystical union that is betwixt Christ and His Church.*" Here again the full Catholic Faith faces the restlessness of men with sure, sane, sensitive insistence upon the sanctities of life. The unit of society is not the individual, but the family. Whatever the situation be or may be in Ireland, all law and order in human life depends upon *Home Rule.* The permanency of the home, the unity of the home, the sanctity of the home finds its supreme guarantee in the Catholic teaching of the indissolubility of Christian marriage: "the twain become one flesh;" the marriage vows are made by the contracting parties, each to the other, before the altar of God, and in the presence of His minister, whose blessing is invoked. The vows are those of mutual love and fidelity "until death do us part;" and the Church prays that the contracting parties, "may surely perform and keep the vow and covenant betwixt them made and may ever remain in perfect love and peace together and live according to God's laws."

Upon the "superstition of divorce," as Mr. Chesterton calls it, no comment is needed here. What I do stress is the sacramental character of marriage,—the mystical union effected, which St. Paul dignifies and exalts by using it as a type of the mystical union of Christ with His Church.

(g) Ordaining: Holy Orders. As for Orders, this again is not magic, but a mystery; not dark sorcery, but a luminous sacrament whereby a man is authoritatively set apart not *from* the Body but *within* the Body of Christ, to mediate the message of Our Lord to men, and to mediate as well His divine, life-giving power; to be a "faithful dispenser of the *Word of God* and of *His Holy Sacraments.*"

(5) This is a day of wide-spread social consciousness. Much of our restlessness arises from a quickened social conscience, from a new emphasis upon social inter-dependence, from a new sense of social obligations. To these social demands comes the Catholic Faith with its noble teaching of the Body of Christ. The life of Christ is embodied in the whole company of His disciples. The Church is today, as it has been throughout the ages, the one great world wide democracy: it

is the one great international brotherhood; it is the one great reminder that salvation is not an individual thing but a social thing. The prayer of the Church is *"Our* Father who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy Name." The confession of the Church is *"We* have erred and strayed from Thy paths like lost sheep." She is the Body of Christ still incarnate. And every part of that Body is sensitive to whatever happens in any other part. It is a body compact and knitted together. It is not national but super-national. It is not local but universal. It is not even earthly, but a communion of saints out of the flesh as well as in the flesh. And it is not satisfied, as Jesus cannot be satisfied, until the redemption of the whole race has been accomplished. The world is indeed webbed into one fabric, and in the great contacts revealed today as never before, lie terrifying possibilities of strife and endless war, or the noble possibilities of realizing fraternity and love and mutual service within the Body of Christ. The League of Nations is a noble effort toward internationalism, but the Church, the Body of Christ, far transcends it, because it is not a league or federation of human groups, but a great spiritual unity of faith, of experience, of growth, of action, of life in Jesus.

I know that there is a tendency to interpret the social teaching of the Church in a variety of ways. But after all, her work is not so much to dig trenches in this domain or that of the social order; her main concern is to supply the spiritual stream of the life of God into all parts of the social order. The Church's paramount duty is that of fertilizing and fructifying by the wide and generous flow of her spiritual ministries. "The Church's paramount duty is not to stir men to a number of endeavors, however useful, but to bring to men God, their Saviour, and their Captain in the saving of the world."

There is a great movement going forward for Church unity, for realizing again the oneness of the Body of Christ. We, of this historic part of the Catholic Church are in the van of that movement. We must be patient; we must be fair, and honest, and charitable, and above all, faithful —full of faith. To quote from a distinguished Presbyterian minister, Protestant "Christians of every denomination are more and more realizing that they must be ready to surrender personal preferences, even when these are entwined with hallowed

traditions, to bring themselves under a reasonable ecclesiastical discipline, and to accord fellow-Christians a larger consideration and sympathy, in order to attain that corporate Christian action which is essential if the world is to be reshaped after the mind of Christ. We long for a Church truly Catholic in its inclusion of every life ruled by the Master's spirit." The Catholic Church does not live to perpetuate herself merely; she is in the world to be the hands and feet, the heart, and the mind and the helpfulness of Christ. From her side flows the water of baptism, and the blood that cleanses from all sin. Her voice is still lifted up to proclaim forgiveness of sins to the sinner; her arms stretch out, even as the arms of Christ, calling the weary and heavy laden to come to Him; and her ministries of help go out to the sick, the ignorant and the oppressed and needy everywhere.

Sir Bartle Frere, it is said, was coming to visit a Scotch home; the master of the household, sending a servant to meet him, sought for some description by which the visitor might easily be recognized. "When the train comes in," said the host to the servant, "you will see a tall gentleman, helping somebody." That, in parable, is the Christian ideal. Over these sixty generations, one figure has towered, from the fascination and dominance of whose personality, mankind can never escape. Height and helpfulness in Him were perfectly combined. And the world has come to recognize His Spirit, living again on earth, whenever there appears spiritual altitude blending with lowly service — a tall gentleman, helping somebody. That height and that "stoop to serve," are the dominant notes that must ever mark His Body, the Church.

After all, the restlessness of today is full of hope. It is the restlessness of the springtime. In nature every tree in discontent is making buds and leaves, and every blade of grass is atremble with impatient life. It is the restlessness of passing winter and the oncoming miracle of spring. Not otherwise the restlessness of today speaks of the longings of men for better things. Hopes are alive. Men desperately dissatisfied are reaching out for the new day. "Songs before sunrise" are heard. On every hand there is a wistful and ready hearing for the Catholic Faith. The great tide goes over the world making for a revival of religion and a renewed interest in spiritual things. Will the Church come up to it?

Part of this striving that is in the world is the breath of Heaven, stirring consciences, quickening inquiry, provoking to dreams of a new Heaven and a new Earth. "O, that the armies of God were arrayed! O, joy of the onset!" Will Christianity lose its opportunity? Will the Church fail in this day of its supreme chance? Or will it arise and gird itself and go with fresh vigor out to the world proclaiming the Faith of the Fathers and of the Mothers too? Each one of us must answer. We rose to answer when the nation called; so will we surely rise at the call of God. We went out to make the world "safe for democracy." But we know that democracy will never be safe until that safety is found in the Saviour: until a restless, troubled wearied race finds in Him "the author of peace and lover of concord in knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life, whose service is perfect freedom," and by whom being defended from fear of our enemies, we may pass our time in rest and quietness and enjoy that peace—which the world can neither give nor ever take away.

6.

The Duty of Catholics To-day

OUR title intends us, of course, to set forth in general terms what Catholics ought to do for the best interests of the Catholic Church, considering what it is that the Catholic Church needs today, and in exclusive reference, naturally, to that part of the Catholic Church in which God has placed us and for the good estate of which we are more nearly responsible. Any such statement must preface itself with some sort of attempt to realize what is the state of the Church and what problems grow out of that state and what duties out of those problems.

Doubtless thoughtful churchmen in every age of the Church have supposed their time to be the most difficult the Church has ever seen. It is a constant temptation to think so, and wholesome withal, if it leads to greater concentration of attention and effort and more entire consecration of life and energy to the church's good. Probably it is not possible to determine which of various periods in the Church's history has been most difficult for the generation then in being. The period in which we live provides feeling and emotion and the element of personal contact, and of course it is impossible to gather these things from the dry pages of history. We cannot put ourselves entirely in the place of bygone generations. Howbeit in so far as the suspicion that our time is the most difficult of all times makes us take the problems of our time with the maximum of seriousness, we may welcome the idea and, indeed, help to promote it.

We find ourselves, then, in what seems at first sight to be a quiet back-water of the Church's life, where there is peace and immense exercise of the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Catholics are not bothered any more. We have apparently demonstrated our right to practice our religion with complete satisfaction to ourselves. Whereas once we were persecuted now we are allowed to go our own way. So far as it goes this is a matter of congratulation. But not so much so as it would be were it not for the

fact that everyone else is allowed to go his own way also. It is not only true that Catholics may do what they please, in reason, but that radical protestants may do as they please also. Consequently we are tempted to assume that we are in the midst of an era of toleration. But here again we must be more exact. The phenomenon we notice proves, on examination, to be not so much a sign of the establishment of a spirit of toleration as a sign of the utter decay of discipline. Catholics are not coerced and radical protestants are not coerced and for the reason that no one can be coerced. The machinery of discipline exists as always; the statutes are clear, the rules are plain. But there is not behind them that thing which alone can vitalize them. They are not backed up by the moral force of united belief and uniform opinion. There is radical disagreement as to what formularies mean. There would be, without doubt, heresy trials and disciplinary action incepted because of other alleged malfeasance save for the evident fact that it would be harder and take longer to secure agreement regarding the binding force and meaning of a given formulary than to determine the guilt or innocence of a person accused under it. And here we come to a genuine and very serious crux—to enforce discipline would be to compel the American Church, in her corporate capacity, to decide something. The expresion "deciding something" must be understood to mean taking sides in a controverted matter of doctrine or practice. It is easy for either side in a controversy to claim to be in the right and fully and accurately to represent the mind of the Church, so long as the Church refrains, by the exercise of proper authority, from interpreting her own formulas and allows interpretations already made to fall into desuetude. Obviously the longer this state of things lasts the more securely does each side become settled in what is known in law as "notorious and adverse possession." Consequently to reaffirm a decision or to make a new one is to align the Church officially with one or another well defined position.

Now deciding anything, under these circumstances, is considered by the timorous to be too dangerous a proceeding. Our status quo is so delicately balanced that no one dare tread heavily for fear of upsetting it. And the status quo is the basis upon which the corporate activities of the Church as to external policies is absolutely dependent. Only by the

constant pretense that the Church is at unity in itself, and that churchmen are at one, is it possible to inaugurate far reaching efforts to finance missionary work, and other corporate enterprises, the burden of whose upkeep must be distributed over a wide area of the rank and file of the Church, taken as they come, and without regard to intelligence, consistency or diversity of Church theory. Pretense is the only word that fits the situation; save that one must distinguish and make plain that no scintilla of deceit or indirection inheres in the word as here applied. For the reason that pretense is only actual when it deceives someone. In this case no one is deceived. It is the fashion to look at the yawning chasms in the Church and not see them. People act, so far as is possible, as if the chasms were not there. In passing it is to be observed that the final effect of this practice cannot fail to be thoroughly bad. It breeds the notion that many matters of desperate importance do not matter a all: that churchmen only disagree about details: that the theory of Christianity is not of serious moment. These are presages of a calamitous situation which will grow out of the present condition and confront the next generation. Our present trouble is that, so long as for any reason, and particularly the one here named, it is the policy to ignore the doctrinal and practical diversity in the church, the disregard of her venerable laws and of the force of those doctrinal theses to which she is committed; and so long as the popular attitude toward all this is to try to act as if it did not exist: and the official treatment is to relax all discipline: just so long shall we have what we now have.

And what we now have is a condition in which, while, and maybe because, people may do more or less what they please there is grave peril of the spirit of congregationalism. Each herds with his own kind, each kind draws farther and farther into its own shell and the sense of the Church in its corporate capacity, which has responsibilities toward individuals and parishes, and toward which individuals and parishes have duties, is largely lost. And yet in this situation the sense of corporate life does exist and is present; only in its most harmful and distressing phase. All religion, any religion, must in its nature make an appeal to universality. Teachers and disciples must always act and speak as those to

whom the real truth has been revealed. In our present situation this leads, privately, to that miserable sense of being compromised and stultified, each side by the other, through the open and frank disavowal by some person of what any person submits as the teaching and practice and law of the American Church: and in its public form it issues in blast and counter blast of denunciation and denial by professors of our religion in the secular press and a more or less constant and persistent barrage of heated and intemperate polemic, spread out in the exact place where no contest can be decided, and where the issue seems to be with the class least able to know or decide anything. It is agonizing to the clergy but it must be ghastly for the laity.

In passing it is to be said that bad as it is, it is all in the days work of the Church's life. It doesn't show the Church to be impossible: it does not in the least indicate that uniformity of faith and practice are obsolete, passè or unfitted to the modern mind. Nor is it an unworkable situation. It is simply that form in which the life of this part of the Church exhibits itself in this age. It is the kind of church with which those of us now living are called upon by God to work. It may be more or less difficult than other periods. The causes may be this or that. The fact remains that it is a Catholic Church to work with and that devoted labor and consecrated thought under these conditions will yield results as in any other age.

This then is the condition of the Church and our query is—how to cure it. There are two things possible: one is to split the Church and the other is to convert the Church. A situation which would make it humanly impossible for widely different and more or less antagonistic elements to dwell under one roof, even by ignoring one another, is not difficult to imagine. The means of bringing it about are probably discoverable and it might be done. But to what end? One feels that no Catholic can do this or anything analagous to it and still love the Church. No situation in the Church can be imagined which would be intolerable so long as there exists freedom to practice our religion. There have been anxious moments in the changing fortunes of the Church, and doubtless will be again, when zealous, if somewhat nervous, persons have felt that life was becoming too difficult in the American Church and that a parting of the ways was not only imminent.

but ought to be hurried. Everyone should ask himself in such circumstances questions like these—Am I prevented from the practice of my religion or hindered in the enjoyment of it? Is not the unrest I feel almost entirely due to the embarrassment I endure at the compromising of my position by co-religionists whom neither I nor anyone seems able to control? Is any material compromise forced upon me either in the realm of doctrine or practice? Unless some or all of these questions can honestly be answered unfavorably then the American Church, which must still have in it the power to save in life and death, has merely allotted to us a part in a glorious work of salvage. To have a hand, however small, in rescuing a national church is a splendid adventure. Salvation fulfils itself in various ways, which ways depend upon what opportunities are given men by God. No one can help our Lord save by assisting Him in what He happens to be doing at the moment when one is given opportunity to help. What our Lord is doing at this moment is calling upon the American Church to awake to what she is, to realize herself, to make herself plain to men *propria persona.* He offers her magnificient opportunities for the saving of men if she will prepare herself to go before them in her true character. We rise to our own true stature, then, in raising the church to hers. We address ourselves therefore to this task, with the prudent exercise of caution and sense.

When we come to discuss methods for converting the church one must disavow at once any hope of suggesting anything new. The Catholic Revival, now nearing the end of its first century of recognizable history, has had the very evident guidance of the Spirit of God. It has dealt with the intelligences and wills of men. These elements remain the same throughout the ages and the method of approach to them will likely stay fixed. The progress of the Catholic Revival is a process of conversion. All conversion moves along the same lines. The work of a given leader seems to his contemperaries to be different and original. But when we look at it in the light of history we see that it is in its main elements identical with everyone's else work.

However, the situation changes from year to year in the matter of proportion. The area involved alters in extent.

Also the work is modified by the degree to which it is recognized. There is a difference between carrying on work in a field where it is unheard of and carrying on the same work where its purpose is known even if condemned and blown upon. So, perhaps, methods may be expected to differ in degree if not in kind.

For instance procedure under persecution and repression is a different matter from the policy to be pursued under freedom and toleration. Toleration once contented Catholics —now it does not. Indeed it can never do so. Catholics can not be content with a situation which is characterised by the "permissive rubric" which licenses two things and gives concrete form to at least two diverging points of view. Catholics can never settle down under the false and mischievous assumption that "comprehensiveness" is a permanent and abiding note of the Catholic Church. The *terminus ad quem* of the Catholic Revival must be the conversion of the Church to the point where the idea of tolerating and making lawful of two diverging forms of doctrinal expression will be abhorrent to all her people.

First, then, in the list of things which the changing scope of our work suggests as requiring revision and readjustment is the matter of concerted action among Catholics. This has been striven for constantly but the efforts have been for the most part unproductive or largely so. There are certain natural obstacles met with. One very important obstacle is the incurable individualism of some people. The Lord seems to have made one man in every so many a natural and inveterate individualist. Such people wrest to their personal purpose and tinge with their personal hue whatever they do. Probably there is no remedy for this.

But there is one obstacle to united action which has no valid standing and whose true nature must be recognized. That is the attempt to cast obloquy upon any and all idea of a party of the Church. Particularly of late have there been denunciations of the party idea which have been contemptuous not to say bitter.

One asks, why should it be taken for granted that the purpose and intent of a party in the Church is necessarily sinister? All agreed-to plans are not evil conspiracies. Every

plot is not a Guy Fawkes plot. The laws against conspiracy are not intended to prevent concerted action of parties in something of beneficent intent. An agreement to mulct the public funds is an evil thing: a banding together of upright citizens to safe guard the treasury is a worthy public service. What can there be which is blame-worthy in a group, large or small, of earnest and sincere people endeavoring by united action to do the Church a good? It is of value to the Church to secure for her the reverent obedience to her laws, the true preaching of her faith and the lawful administration of her sacraments with a right understanding of all three? Certainly it is. Then it must be worthy as well as wise for those who believe in these things to combine forces to bring them about.

To the charge that party carries with it the idea of division, the reply is obvious that division exists already. To call a group of catholic people the Catholic Party makes them no more different from radical protestants than they would be, considered separately. And if it be said that the party idea makes them more conscious of that difference one simply replies, it is not so. If this division is sometime to be healed, if the controversy which gives birth to it is sometime to be settled, if the American Church is ever to be done drifting and playing opportunist, it must come about through that temperate and judgematical action which alone can be had through party activity: and this, not only because its cause will thus more insistently by presented; but because the dignity of its presentation will be that which must compel notice and demand adjudication as the acts of individuals can never do.

Also it is quite gratuitous to assume that Catholics united in a purpose are prone to look down upon their brethren whose outlook and ideals are different and, so far as possible, to "read them out of the Church." How baseless this supposition is! The whole point of Catholics in the American Church is that their brethren are Catholics also—that every one who is a member of Christ and the child of God and heir to the Kingdom is a Catholic, and their dearest desire is to bring this truth to him with all its implications. They believe that every Episcopalian should have ready and natural access to the Sacrament of Penance and that every Episcopal Minister should be allowed to fast for Mass without exciting

remark. Their affliction is that their brethren do not exercise these privileges and are prevented from giving due heed to allied matters. Catholics say to these Christians with Moses, "Sirs, ye are brethren". It is incompetent for anyone to reply as the Hebrews did to Moses, "Who made thee a judge over us". For true Catholics are not judging their brethren. They are but banded together so that with more effect they may call attention to the richness and resource of that brotherhood in Christ through His Church. Let us not be misled then by this outcry against a party. Nothing but good can come of the banding together of men with honest purpose and sincere and devout intent.

But our point is that at present we have no Catholic party. We have but the ingredients for making one. God leads men more or less in the same direction, who submit themselves to be led. What we have had up to now has been that leading, of individuals and of small groups. We need something which will make all Catholics in the Church known to one another, at least potentially. Something that will give to each one the comfort and support of the sense of solidarity. We have had attempts at it. The auspices under which we are met tonight is such an attempt. But they have not succeeded because we have not been willing to give up enough for them. Let us explain what we mean.

The American Church is full to the brim of guilds, confraternities, leagues and what not. Some of them began in the days when especial emphasis needed to be laid upon certain neglected doctrines and practices. Their purposes have been served—but they still exist. The average parish is heavily loaded with them. The people, who are the raw material of which they must be made, are already connected with as many of them as they feel able to assume responsibility for. Yet every new attempt to bring into being a general Catholic Society approaches a person at the very time when secular life is most complicated and exacting, and when ecclesiastical life is filled fuller than it will hold with societies which are pledged to the support of what we may call Christian specialties; approaches him with a new form of obligation and a new duty in the matter of meetings, dues and the labor that goes with petty and localized organization. It is pretty plain that all such attempts may come to naught. We must

find the means of sacrificing the emphasis laid upon some societies already existing to make room for another and more general and important one. One is aware that this is a startling suggestion and would take some working out. Yet what else is there for it? The alternative is the forming of some society which imposes the simplest of exactions in the way of small duties while creating a heavy basic obligation: a society which involves little or no parochial machinery and the most modest financial requirements: which will keep in touch with the Church at large and with dispersed individual members by the activities of a central office. And when we have gotten this we may have gotten something too diaphanous to keep the sense of bond alive. It is difficult. But it is necessary.

One does not despair of a solution of the problem. For at the bottom of it lies the very thought with which we began. The right of Catholics to do this or that Catholic thing is now established beyond gainsaying. The whole problem of the Church has changed. Greater perils threaten the Church now: and to the warding of them off must be applied the power which has come to the Church through the Catholic Revival. "Who knoweth," as was said to Esther, "whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this". The enrichment of the spiritual life of the Church through the revival of her Catholic practices and privileges is for this time —for a time when great and serious things impend: when foundations are in danger. To be sure God saves the Church even in spite of men. But is it not the universal economy of God to work through His own tools and build with that which he has formed. If he has fed us and nourished us then we must constitute ourselves his support and defence. The purpose of many organizations now existing in the Church has been served: that it is well served is proven by that Catholic consciousness which has grown up in us largely by means of them. It may be time to see their single and varied intent merged into the general intent of the Church and its problems, and the note which each has supplied goes to swell a mighty volume of sound which can be heard farther and waken more souls. Spiritual units have been created and formed everywhere by many agencies. Now we need a great agency which will consolidate them into one conscious whole. So basic is this first need that one is almost justified in saying that were

it supplied every other problem before us would suggest its own solution.

The advantages likely to come with a far reaching organization which would connect up all Catholics in will and purpose and sympathy are fairly obvious: yet perhaps not always valued at their true worth. Individualism is the inevitable charge brought against those who make Catholic beginnings or persist in a Catholic policy. But the danger of allowing this indictment to seem to stick to the accused is more general than local, and more harmful in its general effects than in its local affects. The harm is not so great in the parish as it is in the Church at large. Pearls are just pearls until they are strung upon a wire. Then they become a necklace and their value is in their sorting and association. Catholic clergy and laity are just individuals in the eyes of their fellows until something connects them up with other Catholics. Then they become a movement. Directly they become a movement that which they do acquires a standing which is instantly arresting and worth looking into. Two men taking salt on their porridge are merely peculiar. Two thousand men doing the same are a phenomenon. When so many do a thing there must be some reason for it. The reason may be a good one. They may have stumbled upon some startling truth about salt or porridge which everyone ought to know for his own good. Again, it is a question of avoirdupois. A single lump of coal on the side walk makes no difficulty for the pedestrian public. Some foot will kick it out of the way. A bushel of it, however, must be walked round. A ton of it holds up traffic and someone wishes to know why it is there. Catholics cannot afford to allow any Catholic work or manifestation to be ignored for the sake of the lack of association and moral support.

Bishop Grafton once said to the writer "When I was made a bishop I set myself a work. I had in mind what inspiration and help St. Clement's church, Philadelphia, had been to Catholics everywhere, even to those who had never seen it. I determined to make a diocese which would be, in its proportion, to the Church in America what St. Clement's had been." It is not merely that a given priest or laymen needs moral support to keep up his courage in a long and patient labor against prejudice and ignorance. It is that that which he does

and teaches shall have standing in the eyes of those who look upon it with suspicion and misgiving, as being representative of a view of religion and a faith in the Church, which is held and practiced by a vast number of people. Everyone in England knows the English Church Union. Even if it be known only to be distrusted still it is known: and what is done as representative of it is not likely to be considered the crochet of some individual. A priest lately told the writer that the writer's objection to the practice of communion by intinction in which the intincted Host was placed in the hands of the faithful (the practice in the speaker's parish) was a matter of temperament. Is it possible that for all these years Catholics have worked and taught and practiced and that to this day their deeprooted doctrinal instinct and devout practices can be regarded by any mature person in the Church as being temperamental? There has been something wrong in the way we have gone about it. We can still be seen and regarded as individuals. Something must be done to make that impossible.

There is another form of united action which is important —and that is simultaneous action. Catholics have never done things at the same time. We have never learned what everyone else has learned: the tremendous force behind a thing which is done at the same time by a great number of people in many places. Whatever object is before the public has augmented its strength by simultaneous action. But we have been like popping corn over a fire. No one can predict which will be the next kernel to burst. We are constantly surprised to find how much progress has been made in this place and how little in that. Parishes which once led now lag behind. Parishes which once seemed lapsed forever in spiritual somnolence have waked to life. There has been no rallying to a united action all at once.

To be sure the personal equation to some extent enters here. People are not alike—neighborhoods are not alike—priests are not alike. But there must be among us some minds to plan campaigns on wide lines and enough humility among priests and people very largely to sink individuality in a great and concerted movement. And right here is a powerful argument for a strong, wide-spread and coherent union among Catholics. A good deal of the individualism, a good deal of the self-assertion, even a good deal of the sulking, on

the part of single priests and laymen is due to the fact that no association so far formed has been able to make itself out even to Catholics as more than a passing movement of a group. We have not yet made the great party association which will command respect and will make individuals see that their purpose will be better served by it than by their own independent action. This possibility is certainly inherent in the Churchmen's Alliance. But to develope it we must do more for it, sacrifice more for it, propagate it more earnestly, take it more seriously, pray for it more devoutly. Whether or not we have here a germinating thing which will grow up into what we need, the need is beyond cavil. United action we ought to have, simultaneous action we greatly need, a far reaching and definite policy we must supply ourselves. Let us then set about forming, probably for the first time, the Catholic Party and see to it that its objects are plain, its purpose honest, its methods direct and its personnel as wide spread and numerous as it must be, to make possible even what we now have.

And now one other basic modification of the programme for converting the Church, which is demanded by the lapse of time, the results of experience, the progress of the Catholic Revival and the present situation. We have need of a program which will be more consistent and more logical. Let us explain.

It is a fact that the beginning, middle and end of converting the Church is education. Teaching must forever be given and constantly provided, in season and out of season. This has been recognized quite well and always. But, if one may so say, it has been too well recognized. That is, there has been and still is a vast deal of teaching without sufficient demonstration. Our policy has produced, as a by-product, the "catholic-minded priest" and the "catholic-minded layman". We have been producing these and are still doing so. The "catholic-minded" person referred to is like the scribe instructed in the kingdom of God, in that he has in his treasures things new and old. But unlike the scribe he does not bring them forth out of his treasures. He holds to a catholic position in this matter or that. But he doesn't do anything about it. If his opinion is asked he will answer straightly. If he speaks on a controverted subject he will, with restraint, sound a true note.

But he doesn't give ocular demonstration of these things. Until you question him you can't be sure where he stands. He is reliable with the inertia of a solid thing which does not move. His vote would be on the right side; only it isn't registered. He would utter sound judgment: only his opinion is never asked.

He is probably not to blame. Our system and our programme have produced him. We have placed an emphasis upon teaching which teaching unaccompanied with demonstration is too weak to bear. We have dreaded to be or to be thought to be "extreme"—that is to say, consistent and logical. We have somehow hoped that by creating an esoteric atmosphere of catholic opinion the Church would gradually convert itself without being aware of the process and that some morning the Church would wake up and find itself Catholic. We have played up much too strongly the intellectual side of men and have ignored the will and the emotions, which latter things God has put into men for use and for good use in relation to the highest things. And beside it must never be forgotten that the Catholic Religion is not merely a theory—it is also a life. It is quite absolutely necessary that people learning the theory should be beginning to live the life and that exponents of the theory should be exhibiting what the life is.

At this point it is well to ask ourselves what we mean by the word "extreme" and why so many have been afraid to be called by it. What is an extreme person but a consistent one? That is to say one who acts in accordance with a professed theory. Many people believe that the human body will float upon water under certain conditions. Its specific gravity, modified by the volume of air in the lungs and assisted by certain movements and postures will enable it to maintain itself upon the surface. This is a theory held by a countless people. But some persons are extremists and actually precipitate themselves into the water. They hold the theory and they demonstrate it to themselves. Their example inspires other theorists to venture the experiment.

In like manner many persons believe that the American Church is a true branch of the Holy Catholic Church. Some of them are extreme and act as if what they believe were true. Many Bishops believe that they are in apostolic orders. Some of them are extreme and go so far as to do the things the

Apostles did. Many people believe that there is divine, supernatural power in the Sacraments of the Church. Some of them go to the length of behaving as if it were a fact. Many people hold the theory that the Catholic Church being established by Christ to be the pillar and ground of the truth has ultimate authority in faith and morals. And there are people so advanced as actually, upon this supposition, to obey her both in behavior and in belief. What is all this, but showing the fact that Christianity being a life the only valid faith in it is the faith that practices it. There has been too much complacence on the score of our catholic heritage—which has run along the same lines as a good deal of hereditary snobbery. One family may have had a signer of the Constitution for its founder—and is there by freed forever from exerting itself to uphold and defend that governmental basis. There are too many churchmen who are content to know that they are members of a true Catholic Church—they have Abraham for their father. They are "catholic minded". They are not "extreme".

What is needed in the American Church today is to have all "catholic-minded" persons suddenly become extreme: that is to say, to have all theoretical Catholics develop into logical and consistent Catholics. Let them show the Church their faith by their works. The Church is the mystical Body of Christ and by it He continues this which he began to do and to teach. What is characteristic of Christ must be characteristic of His Mystical Body. But the Mystical Body is made up of men. Its initiative is the power and wisdom of the Holy Ghost. But there is no display of initiative apart from the souls of men who make up the Mystical Body. It can only do what they will do. It can but demonstrate itself by their acts. There is no soul of the Church to which a man contributes his own mentality or disposition. The soul of the Church is God. Our problem is not how to convert the soul of the Church but how to influence the Body of Christ which is made of men. Therefore while "catholic-minded" people are waiting in hope of the coming of something unspecified, nothing is moving toward them at all. While we wait for the mere passing of time to convert the Church, secure in a gratuitous confidence that since the Church is Catholic everyone must some day know it, nothing is happening at all. The Church is not being

converted, at least not so fast as it should be. We need consistency and logic. We need to put what is believed into act. We need to cease talking about things and begin to do them. Our teaching has been a good deal stultified because we have not practiced.

Take one notable instance of this theory—the matter of the presence of our Lord in the Sacrament of the Altar. Many a parish has been taught this sound doctrine for a generation or more. It has been taught by clever men and by clumsy men: by men it liked and men it did not like; by popular men and unpopular men. And for some reason the matter has never really come home to the minds of people until they were shown how people act who believe Christ to be present. It has taken some form of devotion to the Reserved Sacrament to make the matter plain. And all at once, as fire spreads in inflammable stuff, the hearts of the theorists have come alive. And what is noteworthy is that the change has not been as if there had been revealed to them a new sort of Lord. Quite evidently they know that "this God is our God forever and ever" and Christ has made himself plain to them in the Mass as never before.

It is but a single instance. But it is typical. We have gone far in spreading knowledge. We have accomplished great things in popularizing information about the Church. And nothing proves it more than that the very terms in which catholic teachers and preachers have been wont to couch their reference to the things they hold and teach can now be used by men of all schools in a manner which will ingratiate a speaker without committing him to anything. Our slogans have become household words and serve a multiple purpose. The fact is that when one has gone as far as he can with the human intellect he has not gone very far, because there remain great areas yet untouched. Wills and emotions must also be engaged. And this can be done only by the outward and visible sign.

So we need consistency. Catholic priests and catholic laymen must begin to press harder for catholic privileges in more places. Let them not be held back by the fear that what they do or what they desire will be considered extreme. Perhaps the word is not altogether misleading because, naturally, the extremity of belief is the belief that takes form in act.

It would be a bold person who would have the effrontery to suggest, along with such counsel as this, that he has a ready-made plan for every parish priest and for every lay person. Due account will always have to be taken of local circumstances and of the personal equation. But the fact remains that the meek-spiritedness of catholic people has not led to their inheriting the earth to any noticeable extent. We have been giving way perpetually. Our faith has enabled us to sink our preferences, to hang back from insisting upon what we know to be right and good and according to the mind and genius of the Catholic Church. We have followed the line of least resistance. We have been tender-hearted to a degree with regard to the backwardness of our brethren. And all the time what our brethren have needed has been this very demonstration of what possibilities are in the Church. We have talked, we have forecast, we have looked forward. A quite needless mystery has cloaked our ambitions in the minds of our brethren. It has seemed to them that this which we want to do must be some fearfully reactionary thing, something rich in disastrous possibility, because we so hesitate to do it or ask for it. We have been so timorous that we have imparted our fear to the people who have no idea of our hope or plan. And all the time the wholesomeness and sweet reasonableness of what we desire awaits demonstration in the eyes of those whose imaginations will be touched by an act, though their minds have not been moved by a half heard and wholly misunderstood theory.

A well known English priest said a few months ago that if every parish in England should begin on a given Sunday to have for its chief service the Mass with all proper accompaniments, the Church of England would lose so few communicants that the number would not be noticed. His statement of course must be considered as generic. But his point is well taken and his judgement in all probability true. Simultaneous action, with frankness and consistency, is without doubt what is needed at this stage of the Catholic Revival. Lay folk underrate their power in the Church. Catholic privileges could be had for insistent asking in many places where they are not now enjoyed. As things are now, a well trained lay person removes from a parish in which he has had all that the Church can do for him and settles down in the parish

where his worldly affairs have placed him, prepared to get along with what he finds and to make it answer. A few times in the year he is able to reach some Catholic centre where he revels, as in a luxury, in what should be the customary thing. Frequently he finds himself, under these circumstances, living in a parish where the priest is in some sort of sympathy with him, but not what could be called active sympathy. That is to say the rector admits the truth of all the layman believes but he is afraid to do anything about it. There is the general atmosphere of playing a waiting game. Let us see to it that this waiting is not a peaceful process. Let every catholic keep his desire in view. His object is a positive one—his argument is a constructive one. It is always easier to maintain and defend, than the negative point which is opposed to him. The unjust judge who is not interested in the rights of the case will yet listen to a plea which is constant and unrelenting.

And here we come to our third point. That is that no one must ever lose sight of the fact that he is concerned in something which affects the interest of the whole Church and of all people, lay and cleric. It may be my duty to sink my personal preference where it seems to run counter to the greatest good of the greatest number. But our privilege in the Catholic nature and status of the American Church is a matter only incidentally personal. There is a direct relation between the conversion of this Church and the peace of it. That relation is probably a hostile one. There is a peace which is hard to distinguish from the lethagy of something moribund. There is what Mr. Chesterton calls "a base equality and an evil peace." It is often a godly act to disrupt this sort of thing. There will never be real peace in the Church until it is converted. We simulate peace these days by keeping peace locally in parishes and usually, alas, by keeping the parishes far apart in spirit and act—so that no one shall see that what produces peace in one place is quite alien to what produces it in another. Our own parish is where our souls live and are nourished. They are intended to inspire us with what will make us alive to the needs of other men in other parishes. If we draw strength from our own altar let us regard it as given of God to help us do our part in the general reconstruction of the whole Church. A proper citizen, who has a tight roof, and enough food and fuel for his family is

interested in seeing that every other man has the same. When he loses this interest he ceases to be a social unit of value. It is undeniable that many catholic people, and priests too, have lost this sense of corporate interest: or it may be that they despair of any means by which they can show this interest and bring it to bear.

We must find a way to show it—we must find a way to bring it to bear—else the catholic revival is in a fair way to deserve all the unkind things that its detractors say of it. We must see our local interests always in their relation to the general interests. Kant's universal criterion is not a bad rule for American Catholics, "Let everything that you do be such as would serve as a standard for everyone's action". There are great and broad policies of the Church which this generation must see in their relation to all local and personal effort or else nothing that it does will advance these policies and whatever of benefit accrues from this generation will be the result of drift rather than of action: and woefully insufficient.

And a last thing. Certain specific and outstanding problems confront the Church in America at this moment. The Churchmen's Alliance springs out of the need created by the present crisis. It would be easy, it might even be very interesting, to touch upon these things. But our feeling is that the sense of the nature of the Church, when it is wide-spread enough, will show to all loyal churchmen how it bears on a given problem. There is a temper in the Church which is prone to decide questions on the ground of expediency. It is not the catholic temper. This latter believes that all problems are to be settled by inquiring what the Church ought to do in a given situation considering Who and What she is. All these problems will be answered wrongly in varying degree of disaster until the latter point of view becomes predominant.

And to make this view predominant the church must be carrying on her normal work, which is the production of sanctity in individuals. After all what do we hope to do for the Church by the more complete demonstration of her catholic character? Is it not to show all the world that the more frankly catholic she is the more she fosters and inculcates religion? That she produces, when functioning properly, a type of character and a degree of intelligence and spiritual acceptance that nothing else can produce? Whatever our policy may be

at any moment, whatever tactics commend themselves to us, this thing must go on and go on furiously. It is constantly said of catholics in the Church that everyone would be better off were we to mind our own business. Amen to that. Let us mind our own business and show it the best business being done in the Church today. Let us mind it so that all may see it is the one business best worth minding. Let each show in himself that is boasting of the Church is not vain. Let every parish endeavor to show its first interest in the catholic religion, religious. Let every priest endeavor to exhibit in his own life and the lives of his people a living example of what the Church can do.

Of the disease that afflicts the Church various symptoms crop out from time to time. A rather lurching and head-long pursuit after unity is one of them. A certain malaise called 'comprehensiveness' is another. A hardening of the heart which is supposed to make necessary a writing of divorcement is another. Some sort of unwholesome obesity which makes the creed tight at the arm holes is another. There are many. But they are symptoms of a disease. The trouble is deep-seated. Like all disease the local treatment of symptoms is of less consequence than the hidden thing which is constitutionally wrong. It is the practice of our religion, and the uniting of human hearts and wills to the heart and will of our Lord that will cure these manifestations. Whatever we do, in forming a veritable party, in securing united and simultaneous action, in showing ourselves bravely consistent, let it be apparent before all things, to ourselves and to our wavering and unconvinced brethren, that we seek only to make the Church more genuinely religious and to display her in the eyes of the world as a still more efficient instrument of Salvation.

THE SCHULTE PRESS
NEW YORK